LIBRARY OF
WELLESLEY COLLEGE

DISCARD
PURCHASED FROM
LIBRARY FUNDS

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024

https://archive.org/details/encouragementofl0000fuku

FUKUZAWA YUKICHI'S

An Encouragement of Learning

A *Monumenta Nipponica*
Monograph

FUKUZAWA YUKICHI'S

An Encouragement of Learning

TRANSLATED, WITH AN INTRODUCTION, BY

DAVID A. DILWORTH

AND

UMEYO HIRANO

PUBLISHED BY

SOPHIA UNIVERSITY, TOKYO

ThB
775
F81313

PUBLISHED BY
SOPHIA UNIVERSITY
7, KIOI-CHŌ, CHIYODA-KU
TOKYO, 102

Copyright in Japan 1969, by *Monumenta Nipponica,* all rights reserved

Library of Congress Catalog Card No. 70–97722

PRINTED IN JAPAN

PETER BROGREN, THE VOYAGERS' PRESS, TOKYO

To Mary and the Children

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION *page* ix

SECTION ONE 1
Postscript 7

SECTION TWO
Foreword 9
The Equality of Men 10

SECTION THREE
The Equality of Nations 15
National Independence Through Personal Independence 16

SECTION FOUR
The Duty of Scholars 21
Appendix 27

SECTION FIVE
Speech Delivered 1 January 1874 29

SECTION SIX
The Importance of National Laws 35

SECTION SEVEN
The Duties of the Citizens of the Nation 41

SECTION EIGHT
Respect for the Independence of Others 49

SECTION NINE
A Letter to an Old Friend in Nakatsu Stating Two Ways of Learning 57

SECTION TEN
Letter to Nakatsu, Continued 63

SECTION ELEVEN
The Falsity of the Idea of Moral Subordination 69

SECTION TWELVE
An Encouragement of Public Speaking 75
The Refinement of Moral Character 76

SECTION THIRTEEN
The Damage of Resentment 81

SECTION FOURTEEN
A Criticism of People's Thoughts 87
The Meaning of the Word *Sewa* 90

SECTION FIFTEEN
Methodic Doubt and Selective Judgement 93

SECTION SIXTEEN
The Spirit of Independence in Everyday Affairs 101
The Compatibility of Intention and Activity 102

SECTION SEVENTEEN
On Popularity 107

APPENDIX
A Defense of *Gakumon no Susume* 115

INDEX 125

INTRODUCTION TO AN ENCOURAGEMENT OF LEARNING

Like many classics, Fukuzawa's *An Encouragement of Learning* now seems to be a work of extreme simplicity. Its simplicity was probably one reason for its immense popularity in its day, and both simplicity and popularity are indications of its historical relevance which has increasingly come to light with the passage of time. Not even originally intended as a work of seventeen brief sections, it grew to its present modest size during the first half of the 1870s only with the encouragement of friends and the increasing self-consciousness of its author. Now, almost a hundred years later, it appears as a watershed which, in simplest terms, demarcates 250 years and more of Japanese intellectual tradition, and which redefines some of the philosophical variables of modern civilization for the Japanese and for all of us who live in today's converging world. With the unsophistication of an author whose fresh and vivid impressions gave him something utterly obvious to say, Fukuzawa succeeded in exposing to critical view some of the loftiest, but timeworn, metaphysical and ethical presuppositions of Chinese and Japanese tradition at the very beginning of Japan's transition from her long feudal period into the modern stage of her history.[1]

After a hundred years, Japan has come a long way along the road of 'modernization'. Yet the last century of the history of Japan—which in some senses is so much heavier with the weight of her past than, for example, contemporary American society—is a mere handful of years. As Fukuzawa often wrote, stone houses and iron bridges are easy enough to build, but the spirits of men change more slowly. He focused attention primarily upon this 'spirit of men', and much of what he wrote may still be relevant for Japanese society today.

Fukuzawa Yukichi (1835–1901) was hardly in a position to bear witness to all the problems involved in the confrontation between East and West in his day, still less to offer completely viable solutions to them. His attempt to apply some of the values of the European Enlightenment philosophers to the problems of the early Meiji period (1868–1912) remains unconvincing. But Fukuzawa was a wonderful observer and critic

[1] Maruyama Masao, *Nihon seiji shisōshi kenkyū*, Tokyo Daigaku Shuppansha, Tokyo, 1952, p. 17.

of his times, and he did succeed in posing some of the important problems at the exciting juncture of Japanese history in which he found himself. He himself wrote in the preface to his *Outline of a Theory of Civilization* (1875) of this call for reappraisal thrust upon his own generation:

> Just 20 years ago, we Japanese scholars were immersed in a purely Japanese civilization. Hence there is little danger of our falling into vague generalities when discussing the past. We have the advantage of being able personally to contrast our pre-Meiji experiences with the new Western civilization. Here, too, we have an edge over Western scholars who must consider the conditions of other countries while living within their own more mature civilization. This kind of living memory of our own generation will never be repeated again, and therefore we have an especially important obligation to make our contribution.

But he was also self-conscious of his potential role in effecting changes in Japanese history, as witnessed in the following words from *An Encouragement of Learning*.

> My own learning is of course inadequate, but I have long been involved in Western studies, so that I command a position above the average in present-day Meiji Japan. As for the recent reforms in society, if I did not chiefly initiate them, I think I may have been indirectly influential in bringing them about. Even if my influence has been slight, I am satisfied with the reforms, and am certain that people will also consider me something of a reformer. Already having the name of a reformer and occupying a position above the average, there may be some who will regard my doings as their model. If this is so, it should be my duty to lead the way for the people.

Some scholars may not be willing to concede Fukuzawa such a generous appraisal of his historical place, but few will deny that his own self-consciousness and self-confidence had some basis in fact.

The mathematical fortunes of history seem also to have favored Fukuzawa. Of the 66 years of his life, the first 34 were pre-Meiji, the last 32 fell within the Meiji period, thus making a balance of almost half and half. In that second half of his career Fukuzawa emerged to be acclaimed as one of the popular intellectuals of his day. Fifteen thousand mourners accompanied his bier as it was borne to the grave in 1901. During this latter half of his lifetime he wrote the great bulk of the 21 volumes, in

14,000 pages, of his *Collected Works*. In his *Autobiography* (1899), he could look back with some satisfaction upon his own accomplishments and those of 'modern Japan', which had just dramatically proved its coming of age in the Sino-Japanese War. Speaking symbolically, two of the great achievements of the Meiji period—the abolition of the feudal domains and their 'values', and the technological modernization which Japan's victory in the Sino-Japanese War portended—were the persistent themes of his own personal life work. Although essentially an outsider and a dissenter from the sources of Meiji political power, Fukuzawa 'wrote the script' for both of these processes in modern Japanese history, at least in the minds of a good portion of the reading public.[2]

Figures concerning *An Encouragement of Learning* do indeed support this contention. Originally begun in 1872 and finished in 1876, its first edition sold 200,000 copies. Computing another 220,000 copies in pirated editions, this means that of a total Japanese population of around 35 million in the 1870s, one out of every 160 persons had bought it, and presumably even more had read it. The percentage is even more dramatic when we discount 'women and children', and the larger illiterate class in the Japan of those days. (Or does this not rather attest to the astonishing degree of 'literacy' in the late Tokugawa and early Meiji periods?) Just as dramatically, *An Encouragement of Learning* went through seventeen printings—a total of about 3,400,000 copies—in Fukuzawa's own lifetime.[3] His earlier work, *Seiyō jijō* (Conditions of the West, 1866), was another best-seller which had a similar impact upon the mind of his times.

If the second half of Fukuzawa's life was the time in which he achieved greatness, the first half was the period of maturation during which Fukuzawa, unwittingly but uncannily, responded to the opportunities which his times presented. (In his *Outline of a Theory of Civilization*, 'responding to the places and the times' is one of the guiding ideas.) The years between his twentieth through thirty-fourth years coincided with the years from the coming of Perry's 'Black Ships' in 1853 to the Restoration of Imperial Rule in 1868.

Let us take, for example, the year 1860 as a year symbolic of Fukuzawa's own particular kind of response to the fortunes of the times. In that year, an important political assassination of the *tairō*, Ii Naosuke, was carried out by Mito clansmen. After a brief but belated show of strength by the Tokugawa shogunate, this event was one turning point for the advocates

[2] Koizumi Shinzō, *Fukuzawa Yukichi*, Iwanami Shoten, Tokyo, 1966, pp. 5–7.

[3] ibid. p. 28.

of *sonnō* ('revere the Emperor') and *jōi* ('expel the barbarians'). That very year, Fukuzawa Yukichi, only 27 years old and recently arrived in Edo from Osaka, managed to sail to America on the first trans-Pacific voyage of a Japanese manned vessel. As the philosopher Watsuji Tetsurō has pointed out,[4] this event was an even greater one in the total range of Japanese history than the assassination of Ii Naosuke. For the four-month round trip of the *Kanrin Maru* signified the beginning of the recovery of technological ground lost to the West during the 300-year period from the first coming of the Europeans to Japan in the sixteenth century and the eventual national seclusion policy of Tokugawa Japan.

One portent of the eventual greatness of the author of *An Encouragement of Learning* was that he managed to be one of the vanguard of this historical voyage. Who was this young man, Fukuzawa Yukichi, and how did he get to be signed on as an attendant to the ship's captain, one Kimura Settsu no Kami?

In terms of the social patterns and the very physical landscape of Fukuzawa's youth, sailing aboard the *Kanrin Maru* was a remarkable feat in itself. Fukuzawa was born in Osaka in 1834 in the residence of the *han* treasury as the last son of a lower samurai of the Nakatsu domain of Buzen. After the death of his father when Fukuzawa was 19 months old, he and four other brothers and sisters were raised by their mother in the Nakatsu domain in Kyushu, far from the center of political activity in Edo. His father had been a devotee of the Confucian scholar Itō Jinsai, and seems to have spent an unsatisfied life because of his position as the manager of the *han*'s accounts in Osaka, a position which put a wall between him and his cherished studies. After his father's death, Fukuzawa's mother continued his memory by encouraging her sons' interests in Chinese Learning. But even so, insufficient means almost forced the termination of Fukuzawa's education.

However, at about the age of 15 Fukuzawa spontaneously developed an ambition to study. He tells us that in a period of four or five years he had read through the Chinese Classics and Histories, had read the *Tso Chuan* eleven times, and had memorized many of the interesting passages. This sign of scholarly resolve brought the encouragement of his elder brother to go to Nagasaki in 1854. This was the year after the coming of Perry. The fortunes of the times had stirred even in the rustic *han* of Nakatsu, and Fukuzawa was there to respond to them in the form of the need for clansmen to learn gunnery techniques in Nagasaki. Now 21, Fukuzawa journeyed to Nagasaki, where he made rapid initial pro-

[4] Watsuji Tetsurō, *Nihon rinri shisōshi*, Iwanami Shoten, Tokyo, 1952, II, p. 738.

gress in his new career. But his early mastery of Dutch was offset by the jealousy incurred by the son of the chief retainer of the Nakatsu domain, whom he had accompanied to Nagasaki. Thus, after a year's time, Fukuzawa decided to set off for Edo, without even returning to Nakatsu. Unknowingly, he was setting out for the *Kanrin Maru* and its epochal voyage.

But his signing on the voyage of the *Kanrin Maru* was to be preceded by a long five-year detour, in which he had first to respond further to the opportunities of the times. His journey from Nagasaki involved great hardships for lack of funds, but Fukuzawa somehow managed to meet his elder brother along the road to Osaka. His brother then advised him to continue his Dutch studies in Osaka where, in 1855, he entered the private school of Ogata Kōan. When his brother died shortly thereafter, Fukuzawa returned to Nakatsu, settled up certain accounts, and with the permission of his mother and the *han*, returned in 1856 to the private school in Osaka to 'learn gunnery'. From his twenty-second through his twenty-fifth years he concentrated on mastering Dutch as well, while also reading extensively in the available books on physics and chemistry. When he went to San Francisco in 1860 on the *Kanrin Maru*, he wrote: 'We were not the least surprised concerning scientific matters, but were completely dumbfounded about social matters'—a remark not entirely inapposite even today when Japanese go to America, or vice versa!

Fukuzawa's exposure to Western learning, therefore, was another important part of the credentials he was amassing at this time. At the age of 25 in 1858 he was summoned to Edo to open up a private school of Dutch studies in the Edo mansion of the Nakatsu *han*. This was the year of the Harris Treaty concluded with America under the powerful influence of Ii Naosuke. The following year the Five Nation Treaty was signed, and the port of Yokohama opened to foreign ships. At this time Fukuzawa visited Yokohama, where he immediately realized the relative uselessness of his knowledge of Dutch and the necessity of knowing English. The very next day Fukuzawa began—mainly on his own—to study English. This incident perhaps best symbolizes Fukuzawa's determination to respond to the places and the times. It was hardly five years since he had set out to study navigation from the Dutch at Nagasaki. Yet this obscure and lowly samurai from Nakatsu was now earnestly studying English, and was aboard the *Kanrin Maru* when she sailed in January of 1860. About 37 days later he was walking the streets of San Francisco, a town of 60,000 at that time, only 12 years after the annexa-

tion of California. Fukuzawa, at the age of 27, was beginning to gather the vivid impressions which made *An Encouragement of Learning* possible.

Even briefly to summarize his ensuing long career would be impossible in the following pages.[5] We can simply note that his literary career was the direct product of the fresh experiences which Fukuzawa had during the next few years. He married in 1861. The next year, at the age of 29, he sailed again as a member of a delegation of the Tokugawa shogunate to Europe. Two years later, in 1864, he was employed by the shogunate in the newly established translation bureau. But this was the year of the shelling of Shimonoseki by the combined squadrons of four Western navies. There quickly followed the first and second expeditions of the shogunate against the western domains of Chōshū and Chōshū-Satsuma, which resulted in the demise of the Tokugawa regime. The same year (1866) that Tokugawa Keiki became the last shogun of the feudal regime, Fukuzawa, now only 33, published his *Seiyō jijō*, a work which became a best seller and contributed its share to the momentum of the times. The next year of 1867, when the young Meiji Emperor received back the reins of political authority, the young Fukuzawa, now 34, made his third trip abroad, this time to America, including Washington, D.C. and New York City. His impressions continued to be first-hand.

The first year of Meiji, 1868, when the Imperial family moved into Edo castle, Fukuzawa was moving his private school, now renamed Keiō, to new quarters. After another move of the future Keiō University in 1871, Fukuzawa published, at the age of 39 in 1872, the first section of *An Encouragement of Learning*. These first years of Meiji saw the abolition of the feudal domains and the creation of national prefectures under the central Meiji government. During the ensuing struggle for political power symbolized by the Korean Affair, the return of Saigō Takamori to Satsuma, and pressure for the announcement of a modern parliament, Fukuzawa was contributing to the new magazine of 'civilization and enlightenment', the *Meirokusha zasshi*, first published in 1874. During this time Fukuzawa also continued to write *An Encouragement of Learning* and to provide the leadership for the Keiō school. Yet in the following year Fukuzawa published his perhaps most ambitious systematic effort on

[5] For a fuller account of Fukuzawa's life and thought in English, see Carmen Blacker, *The Japanese Enlightenment: A Study of Fukuzawa Yukichi*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1964; further bibliographical information is contained in 'A Fukuzawa Bibliography', *KBS Bulletin on Japanese Culture*, Kokusai Bunka Shinkōkai, Tokyo, 87, December 1967-January 1968, pp. 6–9.

the theme of 'civilization and enlightenment', namely *An Outline of a Theory of Civilization*, 1875. By the following year, when Fukuzawa was 43, *An Encouragement of Learning* had already gone into its seventeenth printing.

He continued to write voluminously during the more than thirty remaining years of his career, as the eighteen volumes of his *Collected Works* attest. While an advocate of certain Western values and philosophical ideas of the Enlightenment, Fukuzawa remained a strong nationalist, and seems to have reserved some of his most caustic comments for those of his contemporaries who were superficially addicted to Western learning and modes of life. We have room here only to cite such works as his *Nihon fujinron* (Discussion of Japanese Women, 1885), *Fukuō hyakuwa* (Hundred Stories of Fukuzawa, 1897), and his *Autobiography* written in 1899. Fukuzawa also participated to some degree in the liberal movement and political affairs generally during the 1880s and 1890s, and saw with his own eyes the first fruits of Japanese modernization in the Sino-Japanese War (1884–5) and the promulgation of the Meiji Constitution in 1889. But the great years of his career were perhaps those of the 1870s, when Fukuzawa was one of the leading figures in the Japanese people's rediscovery of themselves in the light of their sudden experience of the West. As a watershed demarcating the old and new Japan, Fukuzawa's writings of the 1870s clearly illustrate the first mix of old and new values, and were a critical reaction to them. Neither an original metaphysician nor a great literary stylist, Fukuzawa's writings nevertheless sparkle with a brilliance that comes from his fresh experiences and powers of observation. His sense of real problems and priorities comes through repeatedly in *An Encouragement of Learning*. But so does a remarkable gift for wit and satire which makes this philosopher, educator, moralist, and just plain surveyor of his times difficult to categorize as anything less than a unique figure in Japanese intellectual history.

David A. Dilworth

SECTION ONE

IT is said that heaven does not create one man above or below another man. This means that when men are born from heaven they all are equal. There is no innate distinction between high and low. It means that men can freely and independently use the myriad things of the world to satisfy their daily needs through the labors of their own bodies and minds, and that, as long as they do not infringe upon the rights of others, may pass their days in happiness. Nevertheless, as we broadly survey the human scene, there are the wise and the stupid, the rich and poor, the noble and lowly, whose conditions seem to differ as greatly as the clouds and the mud. The reason for this is clear. In the *Jitsugokyō* we read that if a man does not learn he will be ignorant, and that a man who is ignorant is stupid. Therefore the distinction between wise and stupid comes down to a matter of education.

Moreover, there are difficult and easy professions in society. The person who performs difficult work is regarded as a man of high station. One who performs easy work is called a person of low station. For work involving intellectual effort is considered more difficult than work done through one's own physical strength. Consequently, such persons as doctors, scholars, government officials, merchants who manage large businesses, farmers who employ many hands, are considered noble and of high station. Being such, their households are naturally wealthy, and they seem to tower above and out of reach of the lower levels of society. But when we inquire into the reason for this, we find that these differences are entirely the result of whether they have or do not have the powers which learning brings. It is not because of some decree of heaven. As the proverb says: heaven does not give riches and dignity to man himself, but to his labors. Therefore, as I have said above, there are no innate status distinctions separating the noble and base, the rich and the poor. It is only the person who has studied diligently, so that he has a mastery over things and events, who becomes noble and rich, while his opposite becomes base and poor.

Learning does not essentially consist in such impractical pursuits as

study of obscure Chinese characters, reading ancient texts which are difficult to make out, or enjoying and writing poetry. These kinds of interests may be useful diversions, but they should not be esteemed as highly as the Confucian and Japanese Learning scholars have esteemed them since ancient times. Among the Chinese Learning scholars, those who have been skilled in practical matters have been few indeed. Rare also has been the *chōnin*[1] who, if he was well versed in poetry, was also successful in business. Consequently we observe that thoughtful *chōnin* and peasants, when they see their own children concentrating on books, fear as good parents that they will eventually bring the family fortune to ruin. This is not without reason. And it proves that such forms of learning are ultimately without practical value and will not serve daily needs.

Such impractical studies should thus be relegated to a secondary position. The object of one's primary efforts should be practical learning that is closer to ordinary human needs. For example, a person should learn the 47-letter *kana* syllabary, methods of letter writing and of accounting, the practice of the abacus, the way to handle weights and measures, and the like. And there are many additional things to be learned. Geography is the guide to the climates not only of Japan, but of the many countries of the world. Physics is the science which investigates the properties and functions of the myriad things of the universe. Histories are books which study the condition of the countries of the past and present by detailed chronicling of the historical ages. Economics explains the financial management of self, family, and the state. Ethics expounds the natural principles of personal moral cultivation and of social intercourse.

For the purpose of studying each of these areas, a person should investigate translations of Western books. In many cases he can use *kana*. But a lad who is young and talented in letters should be taught to read Western languages. By grasping the practical matters of each science, which vary in subject matter and content, he can search for the truth of things and make them serve his present purposes. The above-mentioned subjects are ones common to man, and matters which everyone should have an interest in, irrespective of rank or position. After acquiring such learning, men will go on to create social distinctions as a matter of course. Each will then be able to manage his own family business, and the individual, family, and nation will achieve independence.

[1] 町人, merchant

For the pursuit of learning it is necessary that each person knows his capacity. There are no innate bonds around men. They are born free and unrestricted, and become free adult men and women. Nevertheless, many will become selfish and fall into dissipation, if they assert only their own freedom and do not know their place. 'Place' or capacity means to achieve one's own personal freedom without infringing upon that of others, based on natural principle and in harmony with human feeling. The borderline between freedom and selfishness lies at the point where one does or does not infringe upon the freedom of others. For example, as a person spends his own money to indulge in pleasures and dissipation, it may appear that he can do so to his heart's content. But this is hardly true. For his dissipation becomes an example to others. In the long run, it will harm public morals and become an obstacle to public education. Therefore, even though such a dissolute person spends his own money, his offense is still unallowable.

Again, freedom and independence refer not only to the private self, but to the nation as well. Japan is an island country separated from the Asian continent towards the east. From ancient times it has not had relations with foreign countries. It has relied on its own products and has been self-sufficient. But foreign trade began after the coming of the Americans in the 1850s, creating a situation which has continued up to the present. Even after the opening of the ports there were various debates. Some factions made a great deal of noise about 'national seclusion'[2] and 'expulsion of the foreigners'.[3] But their views were narrow. They were narrow-minded like the proverbial frog in the bottom of the well, and their arguments were not worth listening to. Both Japan and the nations of the West are peoples who live between the same heaven and earth, feel the warmth of the same sun, look up at the same moon, share the same oceans and air, and possess the same human affections. Therefore, nations which have should share with those which have not. We should mutually teach and learn from each other, without shame or pride. We should promote each other's interests and pray for each other's happiness. We should associate with one another following the laws of heaven and humanity. Such an attitude implies acknowledging one's guilt even before the black slaves of Africa, because of reason. But it also means not being afraid of even the warships of England and America, because of principle. It further implies that if this nation is disgraced, every Japanese citizen, to the last man, must sacrifice his life to prevent

[2] *sakoku* 鎖國 [3] *jōi* 攘夷

the decline of her prestige and glory. National independence implies all of these things.

However, such nations as the Chinese have behaved as if there were no other countries in the world but their own. Whenever they see foreigners, they call them barbarians, and revile and scorn them as animals. Without calculating the power of their own country, they recklessly attempted to banish the foreigners, only to be rebuked by the foreigners in return. Such a situation can be said to have come about because they did not truly understand the 'place' of a single nation. If their case be compared to that of an individual person, they have been like someone who has fallen into selfish and dissolute habits because he has not attained natural freedom.

Since the Meiji Restoration, the ways of the Japanese government have been greatly improved. In foreign affairs, we have regular relations with foreign nations in accord with international law. Internally, the government has explained the meaning of independence to the people, and has already allowed the use of family names and horse-riding to the commoners. These changes are among the most commendable since the founding of the Japanese empire. It can be said that the state is now grounded on the principle that all men are socially equal. Therefore, from the present day forward, there will be no such thing as hereditary class rank among the Japanese people. A man will have rank only by dint of his talents, virtues, and accomplishments.

For example, it is natural that we show deference to a government official. But this is not because of the dignity of that person's status. He is accorded that respect only because he performs that important role through his talent and virtues, and because he deals with important laws for the sake of the people. It is the laws which have dignity, not the man. Everyone knows about the notorious processions of the shogun's tea vessels along the Tōkaidō during the period of the Tokugawa shogunate. Not only that, even the shogun's hawks had greater dignity than men. Travellers along the highway had to get off the road at the coming of the shogun's horses. Everything to which the shogun's use was attached, down to the stones and tiles, was invested with awe and dignity. While the people hated these things in their hearts since time immemorial, they naturally perpetuated these practices. Both high and low observed these terrible customs. In short, this was not because of the dignity of the laws or the intrinsic value of those things. It was because they were craven methods used to swell the prestige and glory of the government, to make men cower, and to prevent their freedom. They were false and

vainglorious practices. Today such wretched institutions and customs have all been abolished throughout Japan. Therefore the minds of men should be at peace. If ever they harbor any feeling of injustice against the government, they will not have to swallow their resentment and hate the government in silence. They can seek the office or authorities concerned, quietly lodge their complaints, and discuss them openly. If their case is in accord with natural principle and human feeling, they should not hesitate to fight for it even at the risk of their lives. This is what we can call the 'place' of the citizens of the nation.

As I have said above, each individual man and each individual country, according to the principles of natural reason, is free from bondage. Consequently, if there is some threat which might infringe upon a country's freedom, then that country should not hesitate even to take up arms against all the countries of the world. Similarly, if there is some person who would infringe upon another person's individual freedom, the threatened party should not fear even the officials of the government. Moreover, since in these times the basis of the equality of all classes of society has been established, each and every citizen can enjoy peace and do his own work to his own liking in accord with natural principle. However, since every person has his own respective place, each person must also have the virtues and talents appropriate to it. It is necessary to know the principles of things in order to possess such talents and virtues. It is necessary to study in order to learn the principles of things. This is the reason for the urgency I have placed upon learning.

Looking back upon the developments of recent times, we see that the peasants, artisans, and merchants have risen in dignity a hundred times over their former social statuses, and have gradually reached the point of standing on equal terms with the former samurai families. Even today the way of employment in government service is open to men of character and talent among the formerly non-samurai groups. Therefore they must be aware of their own personal dignity, and place high value on it. They must not act in a base manner. There are no men more pitiable and despicable than the ignorant and illiterate. And the height of ignorance is to be shameless. When people through their own ignorance have fallen into poverty and are hard pressed by hunger and cold, they recklessly hate the rich around them instead of blaming their own stupidity. In the extreme, they form cliques and mount rebellion and insurrection to press their demands. Such solutions can be said to be shameless and law-defying. While people rely on the laws of the realm to preserve their own security and conduct their own businesses, if they

relied only on those laws which suit their purposes and broke those which do not accord with their selfish ends, would not the former and latter practices be contradictory? Again, there are cases of people secure in fortune and from respectable families who know how to amass wealth, but do not know how to educate their own children properly. Since their young have not been properly trained, it is no wonder that they are ignorant. They gradually sink into idleness and dissipation, and there are not a few who in short order ruin the family estate of their ancestors. The method of rational persuasion is useless to control such stupid people. The government is forced to use power to intimidate them. It is because of this that a Western proverb says that there must be a harsh government over stupid people. It is not that the government is harsh; the stupid people have invited this misfortune upon themselves. Conversely, it is reasonable that there should be good government over good people. Therefore in Japan, too, we have this kind of government because the people are this way.

But if the morality of the people sinks below its present level and ignorance and illiteracy increase, then the laws of the government must also become harsher. Conversely, if the people pursue learning, understand the principles of things, and follow the way of modern civilization, then the laws of the government will also become more generous and compassionate. The severity or leniency of the law will naturally be in proportion to the virtue of the people. Who would cherish a harsh government, and dislike a good one? Who would not pray for the wealth and prestige of his own nation? Who would tolerate the contempt of foreign nations? These are ordinary feelings of human nature. One who is patriotic of mind in contemporary society should not be anxious to the extent of disturbing his body and soul. His important aims should be as follows: to let each person conduct himself correctly on the basis of human nature, then diligently to pursue learning and broaden his knowledge, and thirdly to possess knowledge and virtue appropriate to his station in life. Both government and people should have the common purpose that each function in its proper capacity, so that the peace of the country be maintained, the government smoothly administer the affairs of the state, and the people not suffer under its rule. The learning which I am now exhorting has this sole end in view.

POSTSCRIPT

ON the occasion of the opening of a school in my old town of Nakatsu, I wrote this piece on the meaning of learning to present to some old friends there. One of them persuaded me that it would be of greater benefit if I published it widely instead of just circulating it only among my old friends in Nakatsu. I have therefore printed it at the Keiō Private School to make my thoughts known to fellow thinkers.

February 1871

SECTION TWO

FOREWORD

LEARNING in the broad sense can be divided into immaterial and material aspects. The former includes such subjects as ethics, theology, and metaphysics; the latter, such subjects as astronomy, geography, physics, and chemistry. Each branch of learning broadens the range of one's knowledge and experience, gives one discernment into the principles of things and understanding of one's duties as a man. In order to widen one's knowledge and experience, one must listen to the words of others, read books, and form one's own ideas. Therefore, although it is essential to know letters to study, it would be a great misunderstanding of the nature of learning to think that it only consists in reading books, as people have thought from ancient times. Letters are the instruments of learning. They are like the hammers and saws used to build a house. Although hammers and saws are indispensable tools for building a house, a person who only knows their names but not how to build a house cannot be called a carpenter. For this reason, a person who only knows how to read letters but does not know how to discern the principles of things cannot be called a true scholar. Such a person is like a man who is said to have read the Confucian *Analects,* but does not understand it.

A man who has learned the *Kojiki* by heart but doesn't know the present price of rice must be called ignorant in practical studies. A man who has mastered the inner meaning of the Chinese Classics and Histories but doesn't understand the ways of buying and selling, and is quite incompetent in business dealings, must be said to be a failure in the study of business. One who becomes proficient in Western studies after years of hard study and spending enormous sums of money, but is unable to make his own private living, is out of touch with learning pertaining to the current of the times.

Such people may be called mere wholesalers of letters. In merit and capacity they are not different from food-consuming dictionaries. They are useless to the nation, and parasites on the economy. Therefore, household management, accounting, keeping tuned to the trends of the times

are also forms of learning. What is the reason for understanding learning exclusively in the sense of reading Japanese, Chinese, and Western books? I have entitled this book *An Encouragement of Learning*, but I am hardly advocating an exclusive study of books.

In this work, I have expressed the general meaning of learning, sometimes by quoting literally and sometimes by making paraphrases of Western sources, and by citing matters which should be known by everyone in respect to both material and immaterial areas of learning. Having already written a previous section, I will continue its theme in broader terms in this present section. I then plan to write third and fourth chapters as well.

THE EQUALITY OF MEN

AT the beginning of the first section I said that all men are equal, and that they can live in freedom and independence without hereditary status distinctions. I want to develop that idea further here. The birth of man is the work of nature, and not the power of man. Men should love and respect one another, and each person should fulfil his own functions without infringing upon others. For they are men of the same species who share the same heaven and are creatures between the same heaven and earth. For example, the reason that brothers in the same household should cherish one another is that they are children of the same family, and have the same parents whom they serve. This relationship has been enunciated as a great ethical principle.

Therefore, if we inquire into the balance of human relations, we must say that all men are equal. They may not be equal in outward appearances. Equality means equality in essential human rights. But in external conditions there are extreme differences between rich and poor, strong and weak, intelligent and stupid men. Some nobles descended from feudal lords still live in palaces, dress in luxurious clothing, and eat sumptuous foods. There are others who rent their lodgings in back alleys and hardly eke out a living from day to day. Some become the public officials and merchants who move the empire with their splendid talents and knowledge. Others, without wisdom and discernment, spend their lives as candy vendors. Some become powerful *sumō* wrestlers; others, delicate princesses. Thus while they differ like the clouds above and the mud below, still from the point of view of inherent human rights all men are equal without the least distinction between superior and inferior human beings.

In other terms, human rights are the great moral obligations that give dignity to individual human life, protect man's fortune and possessions, and value his honor and reputation. When heaven gives birth to man, it gives him faculties of body and mind and the powers to realize his rights in practice. Therefore under no circumstances should a man be deprived of his rights. The lives of the feudal daimyos and their porters were equal in essential value. A rich merchant protects his million *ryō* no more than the candy vendor protects his four *mon*, each as their own personal property. A proverb about the ills of society says: 'One cannot cope with crying children or the lord of a manor.' Another says: 'Parents and masters say unjust things.' As these proverbs suggest, there are persons who think that human rights can be twisted. But this is a misunderstanding and confusion of the outward appearances of things with essential human rights. The lord of a manor and his peasants may have differed in outward circumstances, but they were equal in essential human rights. What was distressing for the peasants was also distressing for the lord of the manor; what was sweet for the lord was also sweet for the peasants.

It is human nature to avoid what is distressing and to take the sweet. It is a basic human right for man to be able to attain what he wants, as long as he does not infringe upon the rights of others. There was not the slightest distinction between the rights of a lord and his peasants. It was just that the lord was powerful and wealthy, the peasants weak and poor. Wealth and power are relative conditions of man, and of course they are different. But if today one man acts unjustly toward a weak and poor person through his wealth and power, is this not a violation of the other's rights based on the premise that their external circumstances are unequal? It would be comparable to a strong-armed wrestler breaking the arm of his neighbor. His neighbor is of course weaker, but even though weak he can still use his arm to achieve his own benefits. Therefore it is an outrageous infringement if the weak man's arm is broken by the wrestler for no good reason at all.

I should like to apply the above argument to the matters of society. In the time of the Tokugawa shogunate, the distinction between samurai and common people was sharply drawn. The military families recklessly brandished their prestige. They treated the peasants and merchants as despicable criminals. They enacted such notorious laws as that which gave a samurai the right to cut down a commoner. According to these laws the lives of the commoners were not truly their own, but merely borrowed things. The peasants and merchants had to prostrate themselves before the samurai, although they had no connec-

tion with them. And on the roads they had to give way to them, or yield their mats to them indoors. In the extreme case, they suffered the outrageous insult of not being allowed to ride the horses which they themselves reared in their own houses.

The above abuses were instances of injustice between the samurai and commoners in individual relations. But when it comes to the relation between government and commoners, matters were even worse. Not only the shogunate, but the 300 feudal lords each presided over small-scale governments in their individual domains. They treated the common people and merchants despotically. They sometimes seemed compassionate to them, but they did not really recognize their inherent human rights. And there were many reprehensible practices. However, the feudal governments and the people differed only in their relative strength; there was no difference in inherent human rights, as expressed above. The peasants grew rice to feed the people. The merchants engaged in buying and selling goods for the convenience of society. These were the businesses of peasants and merchants, respectively. The government established laws, by which it controlled the wicked and protected the good. This was the business of the government.

This government business cost a great deal of money. But since the government had neither rice nor cash to meet its expenses, it entered into an agreement with the commoners that the latter should pay taxes in money and kind which would fund the treasury of the government. This was the contract, in other words, between government and people. Therefore the peasants and merchants could fulfil their duties by paying taxes and obeying the laws. The government could fulfil its duties by taking these taxes to make correct payments for its expenses and to protect the people. As long as both sides fulfilled their obligations without violating this contract, there could be no further objections. And each side could freely make use of its rights.

However, the government was called *okami-sama* in the time of the Tokugawa shogunate. Those who went on official missions could brandish their prestige recklessly. Not only that, they would eat at the inns along their way without paying. They did not pay their fares for river crossings, and did not pay their carriers' wages. The worst extreme was extorting money from their carriers to spend for drinking sake. These were outrageous cases of 'Might makes right'. Or when, to suit a personal whim, a feudal lord built a house or undertook some needless enterprise through the good offices of some government official, thus squandering money uselessly. When he ran short of funds, he would increase the land-

tax levies or collect incidental taxes and make some high-sounding declaration such as that he was repaying his indebtedness to the country.

But what did this indebtedness to the country mean? Presumably it meant that the peasants and merchants could continue to work in peace and live without fear of robbery or murder. Of course, these conditions were the result of government laws. However, it was the business of the government and its proper duty to make laws and protect the people. Therefore it could not properly be called kindness on the government's part. If the government thought that it was acting out of kindness, then the peasants and merchants could also have said that their taxes paid to the government were also acts of kindness on their part. If the government regarded the lawsuits of the people as its burden, then the people should also have said that it was burdensome to give up five out of every ten bags of their rice crop for land taxes. Thus the matter could be haggled about endlessly. At any rate, if there was indebtedness on both sides, it did not stand to reason that one side should have to express its gratitude unilaterally.

When we inquire into the cause of such evil customs, we find that the government had violated the great principle of the equality of man by taking advantage of the conditions of wealth and poverty, strength and weakness, as evil instruments to obstruct the rights of the poor through its own wealth and power. We must keep uppermost in mind that all men are inherently equal. This is the most important principle of human society. It is called 'reciprocity' or 'equality' in the West. This is what I meant by the equality of all men, of which I spoke in the beginning of Section One.

In the above argument, I champion the side of the peasants and merchants to strengthen their position as much as possible. But there is also an argument on the other side. Generally speaking, in dealing with the people, harshness or moderation in the law must be proportionate to the nature of the people. The essential relation between subjects and government is that they constitute one entity, with distinctions only in functions and duties. There is a strict covenant that the government should act as deputy and lawmaker for the people, while the people should obey the laws without fail.

For example, the people of the present Meiji period have made a contract with the government that they will obey the laws of the present government. Therefore, once the laws have been established, they cannot be changed before their revision, even if they inconvenience some individuals. They must be conscientiously and respectfully observed,

for that is precisely the duty of the people. But there are some ignorant and illiterate persons, who do not know the principles of right and wrong. Their only talents are those of eating, sleeping, and rising. They are ignorant, but they are also greedy. They cheat people right before their eyes and skilfully evade the laws of the government. They know neither the laws of the nation nor their own duties. They have many children, but they do not know how to educate them. They are shameless fools. If the descendants of such people flourish, they will not benefit the country. On the contrary, there may be some who bring it positive harm.

It is quite impossible to use reason in dealing with such foolish people. Even though it is against their will, there is no other expediency than to intimidate them with force so as to prevent greater harm. For this reason, there have been tyrannical governments in the world. This was exactly the situation not only of the shogunate in Japan but also of the countries of Asia since ancient times. Therefore a nation's harsh government is not necessarily attributable to a tyrant or tyrannical officials. The people, through their own ignorance, bring down such misfortune upon themselves. There have been some who, instigated by others, have plotted assassinations, or who misunderstood the new laws and rose up in revolt. Others have broken into the houses of the rich, have drunk their sake, and have robbed them of their money in the name of pressing their claims for justice. Their solutions can scarcely be called human. Even Buddha or Confucius could not devise means to deal with such burglars. Eventually, the law has to be harshly applied. And consequently I am saying that if people want to avoid tyrannical government, they must immediately set their mind to the pursuit of learning, to elevate their own talents and virtues to a position of equality with the government. This is the meaning of the learning which I am encouraging.

SECTION THREE

THE EQUALITY OF NATIONS

IN the previous section I stated that all men, whether rich or poor, strong or weak, members of the government or citizens of the government, have the same inherent human rights. (I will hereafter shorten the phrase *kenri tsūgi*,[1] employed in Section Two, to *kengi*. Both terms correspond to the English word 'rights'.) Here I want to broaden its meaning to discuss the relations between nations as well. Since a nation is a community of people, Japan is a community of the Japanese, England is a community of the English. Japanese and English both live between the same heaven and the same earth. Therefore there is no reason why they should infringe upon each other's rights. If there is no reason for one man to harm another, there is equally no reason for two men to harm two others. The same logical principle applies for one million or ten million; the truth of things does not change according to the number of persons involved.

Now in surveying the present world scene, we find that there are strong and wealthy nations which are called mature civilizations and in which the arts of peace and war are highly developed. There are also poor and weak nations which are primitive or underdeveloped and in which culture and military capacities are still low. In general, the nations of Europe and America illustrate the first category, those of Asia and Africa the second. Nevertheless, the wealth and strength of nations are outward appearances, and it is natural that they are all different. But if the strong and wealthy powers oppress the poor and weak nations, it would be no different from the wrestler in my previous example who could break the arm of a sick person. By reason of the inherent rights of nations, this cannot be allowed. Modern-day Japan as well cannot compare in wealth and strength with the nations of the West. But by reason of the inherent rights of nations, Japan is not the least inferior. If the day comes when Japan suffers injustice from without, we should not fear to take on the whole world as our enemy.

[1] 權利通義

As I have said above in the first section, this is the case in which every Japanese citizen, to the last man, should be willing to sacrifice his life to prevent the decline of the prestige and glory of Japan. Moreover, the outward circumstances of national wealth and power are not irrevocably fixed by nature's decree. They can be changed by the diligent efforts of men. Today's fools can become tomorrow's sages. The rich and mighty of the past can become the poor and weak today. There are not a few examples of this in both ancient and modern times. If we Japanese will begin to pursue learning with spirit and energy, so as to achieve personal independence and thereby enrich and strengthen the nation, why shall we fear the Powers of the West? Let us associate with men of truth, and be rid of those who are not. We shall achieve national independence only after we achieve personal independence.

NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE THROUGH PERSONAL INDEPENDENCE

As I have said above, all nations are equal. But when the people of a nation do not have the spirit of individual independence, the corresponding right of national independence cannot be realized. There are three reasons for this, which I shall develop below.

¶ 1

PERSONS without the spirit of personal independence will not have deep concern for their country.

Independence means to manage one's own personal affairs and not to have a mind to depend upon others. The person who can himself discern the right and wrong of things, and who does not err in the measures he takes, is independent of the wisdom of others. The person who makes his own livelihood through his own physical or mental labors is independent of the financial support of others. If people do not have these independent qualities of mind and are merely reliant on the power of others, the entire nation will be dependents and there will be no one to support them. It will be like a procession of blind men without a guide. Would this not be absurd? Some may say that the people should be kept in a state of dependence and left uninformed. They say that for every thousand blind men there are equally a thousand with sight. Thus let the wise control the masses from above; let the masses obey the will of their superiors. This argument is in fact from the school of Confucius.

But it is a great error in actual fact. There is only one in a thousand who possesses sufficient talent and virtue to be able to govern others in the nation.

Let us suppose that there is a country of a million citizens, of which a thousand are wise, and the more than 999,000 are ignorant. Suppose that the great majority could be controlled by the talent and virtue of the wise, who would love them as children or tend them as sheep. They could, by both kind and severe measures, show them the direction the government is taking. The result might be that the masses would unconsciously obey the orders of their superiors. There would be no incidents of robbery and murder, and there would be peace and good government throughout the land. But essentially this is not the case. The people of the nation are divided into masters and guests. The masters are the one thousand intelligent persons who direct the affairs of the state. The rest are ignorant guests. Being only guests, they have few real concerns. They rely entirely on their masters without taking any initiative themselves. Therefore their solicitude for their country will not be as great as their masters'. Their attitude will indeed be like that of strangers. As long as we are talking about the internal affairs of the nation, they may be bypassed. But if war should break out with a foreign country, the absurdity of this arrangement will be clear. The ignorant and powerless masses may not betray their country, but there will be many who will desert the cause, saying that 'since we are only guests, our lives are uncalled for'. Thus the population of the country is a million strong, but considerably less in actual fact when it comes to defending the nation. It will be quite impossible for that nation to secure its independence.

As I have said above, Japan must be filled with the spirit of independence if we are to defend her against foreign threats. Every citizen must take the responsibility of the nation upon himself, regardless of personal status or prestige. Both the learned and the ignorant, the blind and those who have sight, must fulfil their obligations as citizens of the country. Englishmen should consider England to be their native soil; we Japanese should consider Japan to be ours. Since it is ours, we should treat our own native soil as our own homes. We should not hesitate to lose not only our fortunes but even our lives for the sake of our homeland. This is precisely the great duty of patriotism. Of course, the administration is the government, and those who are politically subordinate are the people. But this is only a division of roles for the sake of efficiency. When the honor of the whole nation is at stake, is it right for the duty of the

citizens to be that of passive bystanders who delegate the affairs of state entirely to the government? Because the name of a country is used in the title of a person's name, as Mr So-and-so of England, or Mr So-and-so of Japan, each person has the right to pursue his daily life in freedom within that country. Once he has this right, he must have duties as well.

In the Sengoku period, when Imagawa Yoshimoto of Suruga led an army of several tens of thousands against Oda Nobunaga, he was ambushed by Nobunaga at Okehazama. Nobunaga then routed Yoshimoto's headquarters and beheaded him. The army of Suruga scattered like frightened spiders. They fled without a clash of arms. The then prestigious government of Imagawa of Suruga collapsed in a day and disappeared forever. Two or three years ago, the French emperor Napoleon was captured by Prussia at the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian war. But the French not only did not abandon hope, they fought back with even greater spirits. They fought with their very blood and guts. After holding firm for several months, a treaty was finally signed, and France had survived. Her fate was entirely different from that of Imagawa. The reason for this difference is that the people of Suruga were entirely dependent upon Yoshimoto alone. Their status was that of guests who did not regard Suruga as their own native province. In France there were many patriotic citizens, each of whom took the responsibility of the nation's crisis upon himself and fought for his own land without needing to be persuaded by others. This made the difference between ancient Suruga and modern France. Judging from this case, we can infer how, in a crisis calling for national defense, those who have the spirit of independence will exhibit deep concern for their country, in contrast to those who have not.

¶ II

THOSE without the spirit of independence within themselves will also be unable to exercise their right of independence when in contact with foreigners outside.

Those who lack the spirit of independence will rely on others. Those who rely on others fear them. Standing in fear of others, they must fawn upon them. Such fear and subordination gradually becomes habitual; they come to wear faces of brass. They know no shame, and do not speak out on questions which call for discussion. In confrontation with others, they only know how to bow to the waist. When this becomes habitual nature, it is not easily changed. For example, family names and horse-

riding have now been permitted the common people, and the law courts have modernized their ways. Therefore the official status of the commoners is equal to that of the old samurai families. Yet their old habits are not changing with equal rapidity. Their basic nature as commoners remains the same as in the days of old. Their speech and dealings with others are still those of inferiors. They cannot utter a single coherent phrase before superiors. When told to stand, they stand; when told to dance, they dance. Their subservience is like that of hungry dogs raised in a house. They truly are spiritless and wear faces of brass.

In the ancient period of national seclusion under the rigid administration of the Tokugawa shogunate, the people were spiritless. But this not only did not interfere with government affairs, it was in fact advantageous. Therefore the shogunate purposely perpetuated their ignorance and subservience—indeed, the officials took pride in doing so. But now that Japan has formal relations with foreign nations, the resultant harm from such policy is evident. For example, if a merchant from a rural area plucks up enough courage to dare to engage in trade with the foreigners at Yokohama, he will first be frightened at their physical size, then at the amounts of their money, the size of their trading houses, the speed of their steamships. He will utterly lose heart. If in the course of time he comes forward to do business with them, he will be boggled by their business techniques. When the foreigners press some unreasonable negotiation, he will not only be dazzled, but will shudder at their power and prestige. While he knows that their demands are unreasonable, he will end up taking great losses at great personal humiliation.

However, this will be the loss not only of that person, but of the entire nation; the humiliation not only of a single individual, but also of Japan. This absurd spirit of the *chōnin* is the result of the fact that they have for generation after generation not tasted the spirit of independence. They have suffered under the samurai and been abused by the law courts. Even when they met with an *ashigaru*[2] who earned a minimum kind of feudal stipend, the *chōnin* had to look up to him as a superior, and this subservient spirit permeated the very marrow of their bones. It could not be washed away overnight. Thus it is not unreasonable that such cowardly people should lose heart before the bold and intrepid foreigners. Their conduct demonstrates my contention that those who lack personal independence cannot stand up independently before foreigners.

[2] 足輕, a samurai of very low rank.

III

THOSE who lack the spirit of independence rely on the power of others and sometimes perpetrate evil deeds.

In the time of the Tokugawa shogunate there were some persons who used the name of prestigious daimyos such as the *Sanke*[3] to lend money, with which they engaged in very unjust transactions. Their manipulations were extremely detestable. If someone were not payed back borrowed money, he should spare no efforts in making repeated appeals to the courts. But if he dared not appeal out of fear of the government, was it not more cowardly for him to demand his money back by threatening with the name and power of others? We no longer hear of such incidents, but are there not some who are now availing themselves of the prestige of foreigners? I do not yet have clear evidence of this, and so I cannot state it positively. But considering past practices, I am not without my suspicions about such maneuvers in present-day society as well. Hereafter, if there is any case of mixed residence with foreigners in which someone uses their reputation to do evil, it will indeed be an indescribable curse upon the nation. Therefore let us not relax our vigilance, saying that it is easy to deal with people who have no spirit of independence. Calamity can arise from unexpected quarters. The weaker the spirit of independence in the people, the stronger will be the danger of the nation being betrayed. This is precisely an instance of perpetrating evil by relying on others, which I mentioned above.

I have enumerated above three instances of misfortune to the nation caused by the absence of the spirit of independence in the people. If there are persons who have the spirit of patriotism to any degree, they must now plan to cultivate their own personal independence, without regard to whether they belong to the public or private sectors of society. If they have strength enough, they must also assist others to achieve their own independence. Parents should foster it in their children; teachers should inculcate it in their pupils. No matter what social origins, every man must stand up independently and protect Japan. In short, a common liberation of man and a common share of the nation's joys and sorrows will be better than the initiative of the few who bind the majority to their will and bear the burdens of government alone.

[3] 三家, 'three Houses' connected with the Tokugawa: 尾張, 紀伊, 水戸.

SECTION FOUR

THE DUTY OF SCHOLARS

LISTEN quietly to what intelligent people are saying these days. Some raise the question of whether Japan, whose future fate of course cannot be known, might be in danger of losing her independence. Others take the opposite position that Japan will gradually develop, by keeping stride with the force of events as she is now actually doing, to attain a high level of prosperity and civilization. Others are more skeptical. They feel we should reserve judgement concerning Japanese independence for two or three decades. Still others make the criticism that if we follow the advice of some foreigners who actually despise Japan, our national independence will be greatly endangered. Needless to say, these are only opinions, which do not immediately coerce our belief or weaken our self-confidence. But these attitudes towards Japanese independence must have some basis in fact, or they would not be consciously entertained. They are therefore worthy of consideration.

Suppose that we now go to England and ask if British independence is in doubt. People will laugh; indeed, no one will consider it worthy of an answer. For British independence is beyond the realm of doubt. This is quite different from our own case. Japan may seem to have advanced in certain respects over its past conditions, but in the final analysis we still cannot avoid raising this question of Japan's independence in the modern world. Should not every native Japanese citizen be concerned about this state of affairs? I myself am a native Japanese. Already being Japanese, I, like every other, should understand and perform my duty. Of course, public administration is the duty of the government, but in human affairs there are also many areas in which the government should not get involved. Therefore, subjects and government must both contribute their share to the public good. We must do our duty as subjects, and the government do its duty as the government, each assisting the other to preserve national independence.

There must be a balance of power to maintain any system. For example, in order to maintain physical health, food, air, and sunlight are

all necessary components. We respond internally to external stimuli such as cold, heat, pain, itching. In this way we harmonize bodily movements. Physical health would not last a single day if the external stimuli were suddenly withdrawn and the body was left to its internal processes only.

The same principle obtains in reference to a nation of people. The government is a country's internal processes. Their harmonious activity and maintenance of national independence require a balance of internal governmental power with the external power of its subjects. There must thus be a balance of internal and external systems. The government is the body and the people are its outside stimuli. Our national independence would also not last a single day were the external stimuli removed so that the government be left with only its own inner organs. A person who understands the structure of the human body and can see the analogy with a country's economic system will have no doubts about my comparison.

Judging from Japan's present situation, we have not yet reached the level of the West in the areas of scholarship, business, and law. But modern civilization is chiefly built upon the foundation of these three areas of endeavor. Without sufficient progress in these three areas, a nation's independence can clearly not be maintained. But in Japan, not one of these spheres has reached maturity.

Since the Meiji Restoration, talented men in government offices have devoted their considerable abilities to national problems. But because of certain unavoidable obstacles in their path, progress has been slower than expected. The chief obstacles have been the ignorance and illiteracy of the people. The government well understands what these obstacles are, and is accordingly promoting learning, clarifying the law, and instructing the people in ways to engage in business enterprises. It has both given advice to the people and taken the initiative itself in certain enterprises. Thus, although it has tried all possible means, the results have not been successful up to now. In fact, the government is as despotic as before, and Japanese subjects continue to be stupid, spiritless and powerless. The slight progress made is out of all proportion to the energies and money spent for it. In the last analysis, this is because the civilization of a nation cannot be made to advance solely through the power of the government.

Some people are saying that it is only a temporary expediency to use governmental means to manage the stupid people until they have sufficiently developed their intellectual and moral levels to be able to enter

the stage of modern civilization on their own. This theory is easy to enunciate but difficult to realize in practice. Since time immemorial, the people of the whole country have suffered under despotic rule which did not allow freedom of expression. They stole security by deception, and escaped punishment by telling lies. Fraud and subterfuge thus became necessary tools of life; injustice and insincerity became daily routine. No one felt ashamed and no one asked questions. Honor had fallen to the ground and disappeared with the wind of the times. How, then, did men have time to love their country? Trying to correct these evil tendencies, the government would brandish its false authority all the more to intimidate and reprove them. But forcing them to be sincere only had the contrary effect. The situation was like using fire to extinguish fire. In the end, the superior and inferior strata of society had grown further and further apart to form separate spiritual make-ups.

This spiritual make-up (*kifū*)[1] resists sudden change. In recent times, the external form of government has been overhauled, but its despotic and oppressive spirit continues as of old. The common people also retain their base and insincere spirit, even after acquiring their rights to some degree. This spirit is intangible, but quickly permeates an individual person. It is not describable from superficial observation, but its real effects are very strong. The truth of my argument can be seen in all forms of life today.

Let me give one example. There are not a few men of talent in government posts today. As I privately listen to what they have to say and observe their actions, I find they are all generally broadminded and magnanimous gentlemen; I not only cannot criticize them, but the speeches and conduct of some of them are admirable. From another point of view, even the commoners are not all foolish, spiritless, and powerless. There are some rare individuals who are just and sincere. But as I look at the actual accomplishments of these gentlemen in their government offices, I am disturbed at the way they administer the affairs of state. The good and faithful subjects too are prone to abandon unashamedly their principles in order to deceive the officials with fraud and tricks as soon as they come in contact with the government. Why is it that such mediocrity and baseness are the order of the day? It is as if they had a body with two heads. In private life they are wise; in office, stupid. If dispersed, there is light; when gathered together, darkness. I might say that the government is an institution wherein the wisdom of the many gather to con-

[1] 氣風

duct the affairs of foolish people. This is indeed an absurd state of affairs.

In short, the reason lies in the fact that, having been oppressed by this spirit, the people have not been able to exercise their natural abilities to the full. Since the Meiji Restoration, the government has been trying to promote scholarship, law, and commerce, but without much result, for the same reason. But now, should the government control the people through a temporary expediency until their intellectual and moral levels develop to an adequate point, and thus coerce the people to become civilized? Or if not that, must it devise a way to deceive them to be good? If the government uses authority, the people will respond with falsehood. If the government uses fraud, the people will only superficially obey. This cannot be called the best policy. Even if it be skilfully executed, it will be of no real benefit to civilization. Therefore I say that the civilization of Japan cannot be made to advance solely by use of government power.

In terms of the above, I find that Japanese civilization will advance only after we sweep away the old spirit that permeates the minds of the people. But it can be swept away by neither government decree nor private admonition. Some persons must take the initiative in doing things in order to show the people where their aims should lie. We cannot look to the farmers, the merchants, or scholars of Japanese or Chinese learning to personify these aims. The scholars of Western learning must fill this role. But they are not entirely measuring up to this assignment. Their numbers have increased of late, and they are giving instructions in Western texts or reading translations. They seem to be making every effort, but in fact there are not a few about whose doings I have some misgivings. For many are merely reading the words without understanding, or understand but do not have the sincerity to put the meanings into practice. I have more than a few doubts about their actual behavior, because such scholars and gentlemen are aware of the existence of official posts but unaware of the existence of their private selves; they know how to stand above the government but not how to be under it. They have ultimately not been able to shake off the bad habits of the scholars of Chinese learning. They have Chinese bodies dressed up in Western clothes.

Let me give actual proof. At the present time, most of this kind of scholars of Western learning have entered government service. The reason for this trend is that they are both greedy for profit and desire to fulfil their long-cherished ambitions for fame. Thus their minds are solely directed to the State, while remaining attached to their ingrained

education. They think that they cannot accomplish anything except through the government. Even persons of high authority and reputation fall under this category of scholar-officials. Their intentions are not always bad, however. It is just that because they have become intoxicated with the spirit of society, they are unaware how contemptible their conduct actually is. This holds true for even scholars of great reputation. How, then, can the people at large fail to imitate them? If a young student reads only a few volumes, he immediately aspires for a post in the government. Young and ambitious merchants want to do business in the name of the government as soon as they have a few hundred gold coins for capital. Schools are licensed by the government, as are preaching, cattle grazing, and sericulture. Almost seventy to eighty per cent of private enterprises have some government connection. Therefore the minds of the people bend more and more to government ways. They admire and trust, or fear and flatter government officials. No one has the sincerity of mind to be independent. Their disgraceful conduct is hardly endurable.

Newspapers being published at the present time, and various memorials, also illustrate this trend. Regulations for publication are not very strict, but the newspapers never carry opinions unfavorable to the authorities. However, every commendable trifle about the government is praised in bold letters. They are like courtesans flattering their guests. If we read the memorials, we find that their wordings are always extremely base. They look up to the government as if it were some god. They look down upon themselves as if they were criminals. They use empty phrases which are unworthy of equal human beings. Yet no one thinks it shameful. From their writings alone we might surmise that these people were all madmen. Yet the publishers of these newspapers and the writers of these memorials are almost all scholars of Western learning. In private life they are not necessarily courtesans or criminals. Their extremes of insincerity are the result of the fact that, never having had an example of equal rights, they are oppressed and blindly led by the spirit of subservience. Thus, they are not able to realize their real capacity as citizens. It is generally correct to say that in Japan there is only a government, and as yet no people. My conclusion is that the present crop of scholars of Western learning cannot lead us in eliminating the old spirit of the people and in advancing Japanese civilization.

If my above argument be allowed, the government cannot be taken as the sole beneficiary of promoting civilization and maintaining national independence. Nor are we to rely on the scholars of Western learning. Therefore I feel I can take it upon myself to lead the way for both the

foolish Japanese subjects and for those Western scholars. My own learning is of course inadequate, but I have long been involved in Western studies, so that I command a position above the average in present-day Japan. As for the recent reforms in society, if I did not chiefly initiate them, I think I may have been indirectly influential in bringing them about. Even if my influence has been slight, I am satisfied with the reforms, and I am certain that people will also consider me something of a reformer. Already having the name of a reformer, and occupying a position above the average, there may be some who will regard my doings as their model. If this is so, it should be my duty now to lead the way for the people.

Now, to accomplish anything at all, it is better to persuade than to command; and it is better to give personal example than to persuade. While this is true, the government has only the power of commanding. Persuasion and actual example belong to the private sector. Therefore I shall first take the position of private enterprise to lecture on the art of learning, go into business, discuss the law, write books, publish papers, etc. I should do any or all of these things within the limits of my capacities and without offending others. I should correctly manage my own affairs within the bounds of the law. Should I suffer injustice due to bad government decrees, I should exhort the government severely without subservience. For it is the extreme urgency of today to make the government wake up to the need of sweeping out old abuses and to revive the rights of the people.

Of course, private enterprises are complicated things, and persons who are involved with them also have their good points. Therefore, it is not right that only a few scholars should take care of the whole enterprise. But I am not just trying to assert my skill in handling various affairs. I am rather trying to point out the direction of private enterprises. But one actual example is better than a hundred arguments. Therefore I shall give the example of my own private work. Human affairs should not merely be under government control. Scholars and merchants also have their jobs to do, as scholars and merchants. The government is what it is, a Japanese government; and the people are what they are, Japanese people. Therefore the people should be shown that they can approach the government without fear and suspicion. They will then gradually understand this direction, and the ingrained spirits of both despotism and social subservience of the government and the people will gradually disappear. For the first time a Japanese people will be born who will be a stimulus to the government instead of its plaything.

Scholarship, business, and law will naturally return to their rightful owners. There will be a balance of powers between government and the people, through which we shall be able to preserve national independence as well.

In summary, I have discussed the pros and cons of scholars today becoming officials or remaining in the private sector to promote the independence of Japan, and this book sides with the latter position. To state things in general, what is not advantageous is necessarily harmful, and what is not profitable is necessarily a loss; there is nothing which is half profitable and half harmful. I am not advocating the private sector for my own gain. I am only discussing it on the basis of my own daily experience. If others can reject my position with strong evidence, or if they can clearly state the disadvantages of the private sector, I shall gladly defer to them. For my ultimate interest is the nation's welfare.

APPENDIX

THERE are several objections to my main argument which I shall report here. The first states that there is no more convenient method than a strong government to get things done. To this I answer that we cannot rely only on government power to promote civilization. This should already be clear from the main text. Moreover, the actual accomplishments of the government have not been so many, despite its years of experience. The private sector may also fail in the long run, but since there are clearly things to be said for it in theory, it should be given a try in practice. Those who doubt its efficacy without giving it a fair trial are not courageous men.

The second objection is that there are few talented men in the government, and if the government is impoverished of its personnel by these men leaving office, this will be an embarrassment to the affairs of State. To this I answer that the reverse is true. Today's government labors under the burden of too many officials. Reduction of the numbers of office holders will have a twofold effect. Offices will be streamlined, and their personnel can meet the needs of society. Indeed, the practice of multiplying offices and of using talented men in useless posts may be said to be a stupid policy. If these talented people leave public office, it will not be that they will leave Japan for foreign shores. They will still be contributing to Japan within Japan. Therefore this fear is ungrounded.

The third objection is that if private persons gather together outside the government, they will themselves constitute something like a govern-

ment, so that the prestige of the original government will decline. To this I reply that this is the talk of small-minded men. Persons in both the private and public sectors are equally Japanese citizens. Therefore they only perform their functions from different positions. But actually they both contribute to the country as a whole through their several complementary efforts. They are not enemies, but truly profitable friends. Moreover, if these men in the private sector violate the law, we should not have the least hesitation about punishing them.

The fourth objection is that even persons who desire to be privately based have no way to make a decent livelihood outside of government. To this I reply that these words are not worthy of scholars and gentlemen. A scholar, one who is concerned with the affairs of the nation, is already a man of no mean accomplishment. There is little danger that he will be forced to live in poverty for lack of talent. There is no reason why public office is an easier road of life than working from a private base. If the former were easier and more profitable than the latter, we should say that there is a disproportion between efforts and rewards. Greed for excessive profit is not the sign of a true gentleman. Persons who cling to public office through no talent of their own, who rely only on good luck, who covet excessive salaries so that they can live in luxury, and who only casually discuss matters of State, will be no friends of mine.

SECTION FIVE

SINCE this work was originally presented as a book for the public and as a text for lower schools, I made every effort from the beginning through the third section to use common words. For it was my intention to keep the style of writing simple. But in the fourth section I changed my style a bit, using perhaps slightly more difficult vocabulary. And since this fifth section is a written record of a lecture which I delivered on 1 January 1874, at the time of a meeting of my colleagues, I fear that its form may similarly be more difficult. The fourth and fifth sections were essays for scholarly audiences.

Present-day scholars are mostly fainthearted, their spirits not firm. But since they can read letters quite well, and they have no trouble even with difficult texts, I have not hesitated to write in a more demanding style in both of these sections, and have naturally elevated their meaning as well. Therefore I have failed in my original resolve of making this work a book for the public. I am sorry for my young readers for this. But from the sixth section on, I promise to return again to my original style, for the convenience of lower-school students. I pray, therefore, that the relative difficulty of the whole work will not be judged by my readers merely in terms of these two sections.

SPEECH DELIVERED 1 JANUARY 1874

WE are gathered here today at the Keiō Private School this first of January 1874. It is a year of Japanese independence, and this school is an independent school within the private sector. For Keiō to reach a new year in this way should be a cause of great joy to us. But this cause for joy can be turned into sorrow. Therefore while today we celebrate, let us not forget that we may sorrow on some future day. Despite changes in government due to war or peace from ancient times down, Japan has never yet lost her independence. For up to today the people of the nation have been satisfied with the custom of national seclusion, so that internal political vicissitudes have been unrelated to foreign affairs. Even inde-

pendence, which was never lost nationally through periods of peaceful rule or civil disorder, was a domestic experience that had not yet clashed in arms with foreigners. We Japanese have been like children raised within a house who have not yet had contact with the outside world. Our weakness, of course, is self-evident.

But now trade with foreign nations has suddenly begun, and is having an impact upon the whole land. Now all matters must be dealt with in comparison with foreign nations. But Japan's civilization, itself barely attained by our ancestors, is no match with that of the West. We must therefore lament our own inadequacies to follow the ways of the West; we must increasingly awaken to the actual dangers to our independence as a nation.

The civilization of a country should not be evaluated in terms of its external forms. Schools, industry, army and navy, are merely external forms of civilization. It is not difficult to create these forms, which can all be purchased with money. But there is additionally a spiritual component, which cannot be seen or heard, bought or sold, lent or borrowed. Yet its influence on the nation is very great. Without it, the schools, industries, and military capabilities lose their meaning. It is indeed the all-important value, i.e. the spirit of civilization, which in turn is the spirit of independence of a people. In modern times, the government has repeatedly founded schools, promoted industries, greatly reformed the army and navy systems, and has almost attained modern civilization in outward form. But no one yet considers the problem of strengthening Japanese independence. No one comes forth to lead the rest. Not only that, while they have had rare chances to gain knowledge of other nations, they first of all become afraid of foreign nations before they have had accurate information of them. Even if they have something to offer, their fear of others prevents them from bringing it forward. In short, if people lack this spirit of independence, the outward forms of modern civilization are ultimately useless.

The reason for this, in the first place, is that the reins of power have been monopolized since time immemorial by the government. From military defense, literature, to industry and commerce, every insignificant affair of the people has been under governmental jurisdiction. The people have always been the dupes of government. In effect, the country has been the private property of the government, and the people have been the guests of the country. The people, like guests without permanent lodgings, just barely managed a parasitical existence within the country. They looked upon it as a lodging house in which they could

neither give full vent to their keenest wishes nor express their full energies. This gradually nurtured the present spiritual climate of Japan. But modern Japan has an even worse problem than this. In all matters, not to go forward is to retreat. No one can mark time without advance or retreat. In present-day Japan, the external forms of modern civilization seem to have progressed, but the energy of the people, which is the spirit of civilization, is daily retreating.

I should like to discuss this point further. In the past regimes of the Ashikaga and Tokugawa, force alone was used to control the people. The people were obedient to the government because they did not have sufficient power of their own. It is not that they admired the government; they only showed faces of submission out of fear. The present government not only has power, but is resourceful and shrewd as well. There is no area in which it lags behind the times. Not ten years since the Meiji Restoration, the reforms in the educational and military systems, in railroad and telegraph, in construction of concrete buildings and iron bridges, are all attributable to the quickness of governmental decisions. The excellence of its accomplishments is in fact astonishing. But they are all exclusively government accomplishments. What regard can the people actually have for them? The people say: Now the government monopolizes both the power and knowledge as well; it is beyond our power. It serves the nation from the clouds above, and we citizens can only depend on it from below. It is the function of the government above to be concerned about the country, but we lowly citizens have nothing to do with it.

In sum, the governments of the past used force, but the present regime uses both force and intelligence. In contrast to the former, the latter is rich in techniques of controlling the people. Past governments deprived the people of power; the present regime robs them of their minds. Past governments controlled men externally, the present regime controls their interior as well. The former was a devil to the people, the latter is now a god. Fear has given place to blind worship. If such abuses of the past are not reformed at this juncture, and the government undertakes something new, the form of civilization may seem to be gradually given shape, but in fact the people will lose all energy, so that the spirit of civilization will gradually wither away. Today the government has a regular army. The people ought to be in high spirits, regarding it as an army for the protection of the country, and celebrating its splendor. But, on the contrary, they regard it only as a strong arm of the government to be feared by them. The government owns the schools and rail-

roads. The people ought to take pride in these things as symbols of the civilization of the country. But, on the contrary, they attribute it to the private kindness of the government and rely more and more on its largesse. The people are already cowering before the Meiji government. How can they have time to enter into competition with the civilization of the West? Therefore I say that without independent energy and spirit, Japan's external forms of civilization will not only be less than useless, but will merely be tools to intimidate men's hearts.

Consequently, the civilization of a nation can be initiated neither from the government above nor from the people below. It must begin from a middle position which expresses the directions of the people as a whole. Success can be expected only after the people stand on terms of equality with the government. In Western history, not one form of business or industry was the creation of the government alone. Their foundations were always laid by the plans of scholars in the middle class. The steam engine was invented by Watt (1736–1819), the railroad was designed by Stevenson (1781–1848). It was Adam Smith (1723–90) who explained the principles of economics and completely changed the methods of business. These great scholars belonged to the so-called middle class. They were neither government administrators nor the laboring masses. Theirs was exactly that middle position which leads the world by power of intellect. Once some device or invention takes form in someone's mind, a private association is founded to concretize it in practical form. It can then make a lasting contribution to civilized progress. At this juncture the duty of the government is to let the creativity of the people take its own course without interference, to understand and protect the direction of public sentiment. Therefore, the people should initiate the affairs of civilization, while the government protects their efforts. The people should own civilization as if it were their private property. They should compete and dispute with one another over its forms. They should take pride in their achievements. The whole nation should respond to each commendable achievement made within the country. Their only fear should be that other nations might beat them to it. In such a situation the matters of civilized progress will all become the instruments of strengthening the spirit of the nation. Everything will be conducive to fostering national independence. But this state of affairs is the exact contrary of what actually prevails in Japan.

At present, the only Japanese in the middle class who can advocate national independence and modern civilization are the scholars. But most of these same scholars are unsatisfied with their present positions. They

are going into government service instead. For they either are not far-sighted, or they are more concerned about their own private interests than those of the nation. Or again, they are intoxicated with the spirit of the times which looks to the government to accomplish everything. They engage in trifling businesses involving both physical and mental labors. Their conduct is mostly ridiculous. But they are personally self-satisfied; and people do not question them. In the worst extreme, some are saying with pride that there are no talented men working outside the government. People should not be blamed individually, for this is the pernicious spirit of the times. Yet it is a great misfortune for Japan.

We should bitterly lament the indifference and apathy which people are showing to the fact that scholars, who ought to be the leaders of civilization, are spiritually declining day by day. We colleagues of Keiō have alone narrowly escaped this calamity. We have cultivated the spirit of independence for these past several years in our own independent institution of learning. And our only desire has been to cultivate the independence of the whole nation. But the currents of the times have inundated the land. When immersed in this contemporary spirit, it is not easy to rise above it. Without great personal efforts, a person will unconsciously be swept along with it. But power to resist will not come from book learning alone. Reading is a mere means to learning. Learning, in turn, ends in practice. Power will come as one actually comes to grip with things in concrete life.

Those members of our school who have realized this in practice should apply their knowledge to the actual advance of Japanese civilization, no matter what the personal cost. Fields to work in are too numerous to mention. Business, law, industry, agriculture, the writing and translation of books, publication of newspapers—almost every affair of civilization—must be made our own. We must take the lead of the people, and act in concert with the government, so that the proper balance of powers will increase the potential of the whole nation. In this way, we shall be able to firm up the faltering condition of Japan's independence, so that we can hold our ground unflinchingly in the event of war with a foreign nation. If years from hence we were to look back with pity on our present lack of independence rather than taking pride in it, would this not be a most happy turn of events? Let scholars therefore set their goals with confidence.

January 1874

SECTION SIX

THE IMPORTANCE OF NATIONAL LAWS

THE government represents the people. It conducts its affairs in accordance with the wishes of the people. Its duty is to arrest those who commit crimes, and to protect those who are innocent. This is what the people desire. Therefore if this purpose can be achieved, the government will be serving the country well. For, in the first place, criminals are wicked, and the innocent are good. There is therefore no reason to object if a good person defends himself against the wicked intentions of another—for example, if that wicked person had attempted to harm the good person, to kill the good person's own loved ones, or to rob his household, it will not be unreasonable if the good person apprehends the wicked person, and perhaps kills him or whips him. But it would be quite impossible to defend oneself against a whole lot of wicked people at once. Or he could not handle the great medical expense, in case this was necessary. Therefore a government is founded to represent the people, and to perform the service of protecting the people. In compensation for this service, the people have promised to pay all the expenses of the government, not to speak of the wages of the officials.

Furthermore, since the government has become the representative of the people and has acquired the right to act in their behalf, its measures are the people's measures, and accordingly the people must obey the law. Hence obedience to the nation's government by the people means, not obedience to laws enacted by the government, but obedience to laws enacted by themselves. Violation of the nation's laws means, not violation of the government's laws, but violation of their own laws. Punishment for violation of the law means punishment by the laws which they themselves have set up. It is as if each subject performed the duties of two persons. The first duty is to found a government to represent the people by arresting the wicked and protecting the innocent. The second is strictly to obey the agreement they have made with the government, and to receive its protection in accordance with the law.

As I have said above, since the people have made a contract to entrust

the authority of the law to the government, they may on no account disobey the law, thereby violating the terms of that contract. It is the right of the government to arrest and execute a murderer. It is the right of the government to arrest and put a robber in prison, to settle lawsuits, to prevent violence and disputes. People must not meddle with these matters to any degree. If, in ignorance of this principle, a person should take it upon himself privately to execute a murderer or arrest and lash a robber, it would be rendering a private decision on the other person's crime and would be a violation of the law of the land. This is called a private judgment, the crime of which is unpardonable. In this case of vendetta, laws of civilized countries are exceedingly severe. We might call this authority without ferocity. In Japan, the authority of the government seems to be prestigious, but some people only fear the superior position of the government, yet do not understand the intrinsic value of the laws in themselves. Let me explain why private vengeance is wrong, and why national laws are intrinsically valuable.

Let us suppose that a burglar enters your house and tries to rob your money by threatening your family. At such a time, the duty of the master of the house is to make a formal complaint to the government and await its disposal of the criminal. But since the present matter is too urgent, there is no time to appeal to the courts. In the meanwhile the burglar has proceeded to enter the storehouse and is about to abscond with your money. If the master of the house tries to stop him, he may endanger his life. Therefore the family must prevent this from happening by taking private steps. They have the temporary right to apprehend the thief, and then appeal to the government. They may have to use a knife or stick which wounds the thief or breaks his leg. In an extreme emergency, they may have to shoot him. But this is the case of the master of the house taking temporary measures to defend himself and his household. It is not an accusation against the thief's wrongdoing, and it is not a direct punishment of his crime.

The government alone can punish the criminal. Therefore, even if one has privately apprehended a robber, he may not kill or lash him. He may not even lay a finger on him. He must report it to the government and abide by its decision. If he kills the thief out of anger, or lashes him, his own crime will be no less than killing or lashing an innocent person. For example, according to one country's laws, a person who steals ten yen will receive a punishment of one hundred thrashings. Kicking another's face will receive a punishment of one hundred thrashings. Now consider the case in which a thief breaks into another's house

and steals ten yen. As he is about to run away, he is captured and tied up by the master of the house. After that, the master of the house kicks the robber's face. According to the laws of that country, the robber should receive one hundred thrashings for stealing ten yen, but the master of the house should also receive one hundred thrashings for his own crime of rendering private decision and kicking him in the face. Such is the severity of the law of that nation. People must take heed of it.

From the above principle it can be understood that private vengeance is evil. The murderer of one's own parent is a criminal of the state. The government alone has the right to arrest and condemn this criminal. In no instance can even the son of the murdered parent take it upon himself to kill this criminal in place of the government. This would be to mistake his duty as a subject of the nation, and to violate his contract made with the government. If the government disposes of the case with undue favoritism to the accused, the son should complain of this injustice to the government. Whatever reasons one may have, one is not entitled on any account to initiate the process of punishment. Even if the murderer of one's parent is lingering before his own eyes, he has no right to retaliate privately.

In the Tokugawa period, the retainers of the Asano family killed Kira Kōzuke-no-suke to avenge the death of lord Asano. Society called them the loyal samurai of Akō. But was this not a great error? The Tokugawa shogunate constituted the government at that time. Both Asano Takumi-no-kami and Kira Kōzuke-no-suke, and the retainers of the Asano house as well, were all Japanese citizens. They had promised the government to obey its laws, and thus to receive the government's protection under the law. However, by some mistake Kira insulted Asano. But the latter did not lodge a complaint with the government; in anger, he attempted to kill Kira directly. This led to a dispute, which ended with the Tokugawa government putting Asano on trial and ordering him to commit *seppuku*. It did not punish Kira. This was a very unjust aspect of the trial. But if the retainers of the Asano house thought this trial unjust, why did they not complain about it to the government?

Now, if each of the forty-seven retainers had made arrangement to lodge a complaint with the authorities concerned according to the law, they might have won their case in the end. The lawsuit might not have been accepted at first, because the government was despotic all along. The complainant might even have been arrested and killed. But then a second retainer of the Asano house might have stepped fearlessly forward to lodge a second complaint. If all the forty-seven retainers had

exposed their lives in their effort to make a just appeal, the government, no matter how bad it was, would eventually have submitted to reason. It would then have punished Kira as well, to make the decision of the trial fair. By such a procedure the retainers of Asano would have shown how truly loyal they were. But they did not know this principle. While being only subjects of the country, they disregarded the value of the laws of the nation to murder Kira. They therefore violated their duties as subjects and trespassed on the right of the government by privately deciding another's crime. Fortunately, they were then condemned to death by the Tokugawa authorities, so that the matter was settled. But if their crime had been condoned, the retainers of the Kira family would surely have taken their own revenge on the retainers of Akō. One vendetta would have followed another until finally all the kinsmen and friends of both sides would have been wiped out. This would have constituted a world of anarchy. Such is the harm of vendetta to the nation; it has no place in the proper disposal of things.

In the past, when Japanese peasants or merchants were rude to a samurai, he had the legal right to cut them down with his sword. This was public approval of private judgment. It was abominable. The laws of the nation must be directly enforced by the government alone. The more numerous the places where laws are issued, the weaker their power. For example, during the feudal period, when each of the three hundred daimyos held the power of life and death over the people, the power of the Tokugawa government was proportionately weaker too.

Assassination is the worst form of private judgment and is most harmful to the government. Looking at the records of assassination from ancient times, we find that some were undertaken out of personal enmity, some to rob money. One who plots such an assassination is from the start an intended criminal. Another kind of assassination is done, not for private motives, but against a political enemy. People's political opinions may vary, but some seem to think that they can take their own opinion as the criterion for deciding another's crime. They therefore kill others at will, infringing upon the prerogative of the government. Not only are they not ashamed of their act, they even boast of having inflicted the 'retribution of heaven'. They are even called patriotic by some.

But what, first of all, is 'the retribution of heaven'? Does it mean to inflict the death penalty in place of heaven? If that were so, one should first examine his own condition. Living in this land from the beginning, what kind of promise has he made with the government? It was to obey the laws without fail, and thus to receive the protection of the govern-

ment. If he has some complaint about certain laws, or thinks that some persons are subversive to the nation, he should quietly lodge a formal complaint with the government. But to bypass the government to take action by oneself in the name of heaven would be the wrongest kind of measure. No matter how sincere, such persons are ignorant of the principles of things. They worry about the country without truly knowing why. In point of fact, no one has ever accomplished anything good by assassination, or increased the well-being of society thereby.

People who do not understand the intrinsic value of laws live only in fear of the government. They don't feel ashamed of having committed a real crime as long as it does not become publicly known. Such lawbreakers who cleverly dodge the law will, on the contrary, sometimes be praised for their cleverness. In the conversations of people we hear such talk as: 'This is a firm law of the land, and that is an official law of the government; but if these things can be "arranged" in such and such a way, it will not publicly interfere with the law, and so it can be kept an official secret.' Thus they talk smilingly, and no one suspects anything. Some go so far as to confer with minor officials to arrange a secret deal. Both parties seem to benefit from the deal, and there seems to be no crime involved. The immutable laws of the land are in fact too complicated and hard to put into practice, so that such secret deals can occur. But from the standpoint of the nation, this kind of thing is a most dangerous abuse.

If people get the habit of disregarding the law in this way, this spirit of insincerity will become universal. Laws which would be beneficial, if obeyed, will be violated, and crime will be the order of the day. For example, government law prohibits urinating on the roads. But people do not understand the value of this prohibition. They are only afraid of being caught by the police. It may be that a person is unexpectedly caught by a policeman when furtively breaking this law in the evening. In that instance he bows before the law, but within his heart he does not consider that he is being punished for a violation of the law. He only thinks that it was his unlucky day for being nabbed in the act. This is indeed very deplorable. Therefore, when the government makes laws, they must be made simple. Once enacted, the laws must be strictly enforced to achieve their purpose. If such laws are inconvenient, the people should freely discuss and complain about them to the authorities. Once they have accepted the laws, they must respectfully obey them.

A case came up recently here at Keiō. Mr Tadami Oota, a peer, had used his own private funds two years ago to hire an American to teach

at the Keiō school. At the expiration of that appointment, Mr Oota wanted to hire another American. An agreement was informally settled between Mr Oota and the interested party. Mr Oota then sent a written application to the Tokyo prefecture government office to hire this American as a teacher of literature. But a law on the books of the Ministry of Education required that even a private institution could not hire a private instructor who did not have in his possession a diploma showing the completion of his course work in his native land. The American did not have his diploma with him in Japan. Mr Oota received official notice that it was permissible to hire him as a language teacher, but not as an instructor in literature. Thereupon, the present writer wrote a letter of application to the prefectural office. I said that I was requesting acceptance of Mr Oota's application because we have rendered a favorable judgement on the American's scholastic competence, despite the fact that he does not have his diploma with him to present. I pointed out that the prefectural office would have simply passed on the application if it had been for language teaching. But since our students had from the first desired to study literature, we had not taken the trouble to deceive the authorities by using the pretext that he was to be a language teacher. My own application was returned to me with the explanation that the regulation of the Ministry of Education could not be changed. Consequently the school had to terminate its negotiations with the prospective teacher. At the end of last December the American returned to the United States. Mr Oota's original good intention came to nought, and several hundred students lost a good opportunity to learn. This was indeed not only a great misfortune for a private institution, but a great drawback to literature for the nation as well. It is a stupid and irksome matter, but the law is important and primary. I intend to make another application in a few days.

Recently Mr Oota and the staff of Keiō informally convened to discuss this case. Since the Ministry of Education's regulation was immutable, it was suggested more than once that the application should be changed to 'language instructor' to have it accepted. But in the end we did not hire the teacher. We decided that the best course of action was to respect and obey the law as befits our position, even if it was a setback for the school. For it is dishonorable for scholars and gentlemen to deceive the government. Of course, this decision may seem to be a mere trifling episode in the life of a single private institution. But I think that the principles at stake have an application to public morals. Therefore I take this opportunity to underline that fact.

SECTION SEVEN

THE DUTIES OF THE CITIZENS OF THE NATION

IN Section Six I discussed the importance of national laws, saying that each citizen has two functions in regard to them. The following is a continuation of the argument of that section. It discusses in even greater detail this function and duty of citizens.

Each citizen has a double office. The first is to be subordinate to the government with the mentality of a guest. The second is to join together with the other citizens of the nation to form a company, as it were, that is called the nation, to enact and implement the laws of the nation. This is the mentality of being a master. For example, if a hundred merchants form some commercial company, establish the rules of the company and implement them, then the hundred merchants are the masters of that company. But once the laws have been established, the said merchants become guests of the company as well, and must obey those laws. Hence the nation is like a company, and its citizens like the members of the company. Each man has both functions of master and guest.

¶1

To take up first their status as guests: the citizens of a nation must honor the laws of the land, and not forget the principle of the equality of men. If I do not want my rights violated by others, then I must in turn not infringe upon the rights of others. Since others enjoy the same things as I do, I must not extend my pleasures by robbing from those of others. I must not steal to enrich myself. I must not kill or slander another. I must correctly uphold the law, and live according to the great principle of the equality of men. Again, there is no reason recklessly to violate laws enacted by the government, even if they are stupid or inconvenient to me. The government has the authority to declare war and conclude treaties with foreign nations. Since this authority ultimately derives from the citizens, a person not connected with administration of the government should not criticize its affairs. If this principle is forgotten, and people think that the measures of the government do not suit their

own private liking, or if they criticize it as they wish, thus violating their agreement with the government, or if they raise up arms in revolt against the government, then the government of a country will not last a single day.

We can go back to our comparison with the company of the hundred merchants. On the basis of common agreement, they elect ten men within the company to be its managers. If the directives of those managers do not please the private opinions of the remaining ninety, so that each criticizes the rules of the company, and goes out to purchase *botamochi*[1] wholesale while the managers want to sell sake, many different decisions will be taken at once. If they begin to negotiate for the *botamochi* on their own private initiative, thus violating the laws of the company and conflicting with the others, the business of the company will also not last a single day. As the company finally goes bankrupt, its loss will be suffered equally by each of the one hundred members. We must avow that this is a most stupid thing to do. Therefore, even if the laws of a country are unjust and inconvenient, there is no reason to take that as an excuse to destroy them. If there are actually points which are unjust and inconvenient, people should peacefully state their case to the government, who are the managers of the country, in order to have these laws amended. If the government does not accede to their private view, the people should do what they can, and at the same time be patient, waiting for the proper time to come.

¶ II

To take up secondly their status as masters, the citizens of a nation are at the same time the government itself. Since not every person can directly administer the affairs of state, this is entrusted to the government, which makes a pact to serve as the representative of the people. Accordingly, the people are the real masters and bosses. The government is their representative and manager. For example, the ten men elected by the commercial company of a hundred merchants are the government, the remaining ninety are the people. The ninety do not directly execute the affairs of the company which they have entrusted to their representatives. But if they consider their own status, they cannot help but call themselves the actual bosses of the company. Again, the ten managers who execute the present affairs of the company have

[1] 牡丹餅

been entrusted to execute business according to the will of the whole company; therefore, they are not making private decisions but those of the company. Similarly, the affairs of government are not private affairs of government officials, but are public affairs of the nation as a whole executed by the representatives of the people.

Therefore the government receives the mandate of the people. According to its pact, it must seek to promote the rights of all, without distinction between high and low, and must not exhibit even one degree of injustice and selfishness in its correct application of the law and punishment of crime. If bandits should illegally break into a person's house, but the government is incapable of controlling them, then it can be said to be in collusion with the bandits. If the government cannot fulfil the principles of the national law, and causes the people to suffer financial losses, it must make reparations, irrespective of amount and age. Thus, for example, if a government official was responsible through his own negligence for the loss incurred by a citizen or a foreigner, he would have to pay a reparation of, say, thirty thousand yen. Since in principle the government does not have its own money, the ones who ultimately pay the bill are, of course, the people. If this thirty thousand yen is proportioned among the Japanese population of thirty million, it comes to ten mon per man. If the negligence of the official costs ten times as much, each citizen would have to pay one hundred mon. That would amount to five hundred mon in a family of five. If the poor farmers in the rural districts had five hundred mon to spend, they could call their wives and children together to celebrate an appropriate feast, and spend the whole night in merriment. Would it not be a miserable thing if through the negligence of one public official the innocent people throughout Japan would be forced to be deprived of their greatest of pleasures? It is unreasonable that the citizens themselves have to foot the bill for such stupidity, but what can be done about it? They themselves are the masters and bosses. They originally made a pact which entrusted the handling of affairs to the government. Since both losses and gains are to be shared by the masters, they cannot be critical of the carelessness of the officials only when they lose money. Therefore the people must always be careful. If they are anxious in heart at the dealings of the government, they should peacefully and frankly state their cases.

Since the people are already the masters of the country, it is their essential obligation to pay for the expenses taken to protect the country. They should hardly grumble over this. To protect the country, salaries must be paid to officials, army and navy appropriations made, expenses

for the law courts and local officials as well. The total sum of this amount seems very great, but it is not so bad if apportioned among the total population. Annual tax revenue in Japan comes to only one or two yen per person. To pay this small amount in return for the protection of the government, so as not to have to fear night burglars or bandits when travelling alone, and to be able to pass one's whole life in peace and security, is indeed a great bargain.

There are relatively profitable businesses everywhere, but there would seem to be nothing as economical as buying the protection of the government through paying taxes. Nowadays there are men spending money on building houses, and striving to acquire the finest clothes and foods. Even worse, there are people ruining their fortunes on amusements and pleasures. The money these people spend is incomparably more than the amount of taxes they pay. If it is spent illicitly, they should hesitate to spend even a single sen. But since tax revenue is money spent not only rightfully, but to purchase the most economical of things, they should pay their taxes gladly.

It is an ideal situation when both the people and the government fulfil their respective roles and come to a mutual understanding in the above way. But when this is not the actual situation, those who are the government may transcend their limits to execute a tyrannical rule. In that instance, the people have only three courses of action. First, they may surrender their integrity and submit to the government. Secondly, they may resist the government by force of arms. Thirdly, they may go as far as sacrificing their lives to uphold the principle of justice.

The first of these courses of action would be extremely immoral. It is the duty of the people to obey the just Way of heaven. But when they surrender their integrity to follow the evil ways contrived by the government, they are violating their duties as men. Moreover, when they surrender their integrity to obey laws, they create corrupt practices in the country as a whole by leaving a legacy of evil precedents to their children. Since ancient times, there have been tyrannical governments over stupid people in Japan as well. If the government wanted to extend its empty prestige, the people shook with fear. They knew that the government's dealings were actually unjust, but they were afraid that if they clearly voiced an opinion about it, the government would become incensed, or they would be made secretly to suffer by the officials in the future. Thus they did not say what should have been said. Such fear of future reprisal is fear of what is vulgarly called the hardness of dog droppings. The people were afraid of such a ridiculous thing. Their

mentality was to bend before the government, no matter how unjust. They thus created the spirit of the whole society which has finally fallen into the wretched condition of today. When they surrendered their integrity they bequeathed calamity to their descendants.

The second recourse is to resist the government by force of arms. Of course, this requires many men, and therefore political cliques must inevitably be formed. This gives rise to civil war. And therefore such a course of action cannot be called the best policy. For the time being the question of right and wrong must be set aside, and we must only discuss which side has more power, once war has been declared. If we survey the history of rebellions in both past and modern times, the power of the people has always been weaker than that of the government. If they do rise up in rebellion, they should of course be overthrowing the past framework of the government. But no matter how corrupt the old regime was, if the new one is also such, there is no justification for it to hold the reins of power for even a few years. Therefore even if they overthrow it out of temporary impulse, it will only be to substitute one form of stupidity and tyranny with another. Moreover, civil wars are caused by the inhumane treatment inflicted upon the people in the past. But there is nothing more inhumane than civil war. The bonds between friends are torn asunder; worse, parents and children become each other's killers, brothers become each other's enemies; homes are burnt down and people slaughtered—thus, evil deeds are rampant. In such frightful circumstances people's hearts become inured to cruelty. As they perform actions which may be called almost beastlike, will they aspire to administer affairs better than the old government, to lighten the burden of the law, so that they can lead the people of the whole country to walk the path of benevolence and human sentiment? I say that such thoughts are wrong.

The third course of action is to sacrifice even one's life to uphold just principles. It means to trust confidently in the principles of the Way of heaven. It means that no matter how bitter the law under which they are made to suffer by tyrannical government, they must endure that suffering without letting their spirits break. Neither taking up arms nor using one-handed power, they should only bring pressure to bear upon the government by advocating just principles.

This third way must be said to be the best policy. If rational pressure is brought to bear upon the government, the existing good administration and laws will not at all be harmed. Their just arguments may perhaps not be adopted, but since it is clear that they stand to reason, as I have

explained, the innate sentiment of men will be swayed by them. Therefore what is not accomplished this year will be accomplished in the following year. Moreover, there is danger that resistance against the government through force of arms will destroy a hundred things in pursuit of one goal, but rational persuasion will sweep out only those evils that should be eliminated, without creating additional troubles. Since their objective is to put an end to governmental injustice, criticism can be stopped as the government returns to just ways. Further, armed resistance will bring angry counterresistance. Instead of reconsidering its own evils, the government will brandish its tyrannical power all the more, and may even aggravate those evils still more. But since even a tyrannical government and its officials are men of the same country, the sight of their fellow countrymen quietly advocating truth by sacrificing their own lives to uphold the principles of justice will ultimately win their hearts. Once this happens, they will repent of their own wrongdoings, naturally throw off their arrogance, and reform their ways.

Such persons who are concerned about their country and undergo sufferings or even sacrifice their lives because of it, are called 'martyrs' in the West. Although a martyr gives only his own life, his accomplishment is superior to a civil war which kills innumerable others and costs an incalculable sum of money. Since ancient times, many Japanese have died on the battlefield or committed *seppuku*. They have all been highly praised as loyal retainers. But the reason for their heroic deaths was in most cases related to a war between two feudal lords who were vying for political supremacy, or to some vendetta for their lords. To give one's life so nobly may seem in outward appearance to be admirable, but in actual fact it was of no benefit to society. The idea that the mere sacrifice of one's life is everything, whether it is for the sake of one's lord or out of apology to him, is common in uncivilized societies. But in the light of modern civilization, such people must be said not to have known the true reason for sacrificing their lives.

In essence, civilization means to advance the level of intelligence and virtue of the people, so that each and every person can be the master of his own affairs in his dealings with society. It means that without harm to either side, every person may fulfil his own rights and thereby contribute to the security and prosperity of all. Therefore, are civil wars or vendettas actually in accord with the purpose of civilization? Dying in battle or in a vendetta may seem to be rational if there is the sure prospect that this society may be enabled to become more civilized by creating business and industry and contributing to the general security and

prosperity, only through the agency of winning a civil war and destroying the enemy, or accomplishing the vendetta and saving the lord's honor. But in actual fact these were never the goals. Probably even the famous loyal samurai did not entertain such intentions. They must have acted only out of bounden obligation and apology to their lords.

Such examples as the following are not unheard of. A certain Gonsuke, while on an errand for his master, loses one *ryō* of gold. At his wit's end, he decides that he cannot apologize, and so he ties his loincloth to the branch of a tree and hangs himself. If we truly consider this loyal servant's frame of mind when he resolved to kill himself, we must pity him. He went out on an errand, but took his own life before returning. He thus becomes an eternal hero whose story makes us moisten our sleeves with tears. To kill oneself to fulfil the master-servant relationship after having lost one *ryō* of gold received in trust is no less noble than the stories of the loyal samurai of the past and present. However, while his loyalty should shine bright like the sun and the moon, and his meritorious deed should be eternal with the heaven and the earth, people are all cold-hearted and belittle this Gonsuke. They make no memorial stone to commemorate his deed, and build no shrine to worship him. Why is this? People may say, 'Because Gonsuke's death was merely for the one *ryō* of gold. The reason was too trivial.'

But we cannot discuss the relative gravity of a deed merely in terms of the amount of money or number of persons involved. Our criterion should be whether it was beneficial to the advance of civilization. Though the loyal samurai died in battle while killing ten thousand of the enemy and poor Gonsuke hanged himself for losing one *ryō* of gold, they were truly the same in regard to the fact that neither of them benefited civilization through their deaths. Since neither can be more highly evaluated, we may say that neither knew the true reasons for giving their lives. Neither can be called a 'martyr'. From what I know, there was only one person from ancient times who advocated human rights, who brought pressure to bear upon the government by championing the cause of justice, and who remained steadfast and kept his integrity to the end, when he sacrificed his life. This was Sakura Sōgo,[2] whose biography is found only in popular fiction handed down by the common people, but whose true story has still not been told by the historians. Some future day, if his history becomes clear, I shall record it and reveal his merits and virtues, to offer them as a model to men.

[2] 佐倉宗吾 (1604–45), a public-spirited headman of a village in the domain o Sakura in the province of Shimofusa.

SECTION EIGHT

RESPECT FOR THE INDEPENDENCE OF OTHERS

IN the work entitled *Moral Science* by the American named Wayland, there is a discussion of the freedom of the human mind and body. The general point of this book is that each person constitutes an independent entity who is the master of his own affairs, uses his own intelligence, and executes his own necessary business. Therefore:

a) Every person has a physical body through which he comes in contact with things. He uses these things to fulfil his own needs. For example, he can plant seeds to grow rice, or make clothes from cotton.

b) Every person has an intellect through which he can discover the principles of things, which will guide him in doing things. For example, he can devise methods of fertilization for rice cultivation, or design a loom to weave cotton thread. These are functions of intelligence and discernment.

c) Every person has emotions, through which he activates the functions of mind and body. By satisfying these emotions he can achieve happiness. For example, every human being loves fine clothes and delicious foods. Still, these things are not natural products of the earth. Men must work to make them. Therefore, human action generally arises from the spur of human desires, which are the necessary catalysts for action. These actions, in turn, are the indispensable conditions for attaining happiness. It may be said that such persons as Zen priests have neither actions nor happiness.

d) Every person has an honest mind, which controls his desires, turns their tendencies in the right direction and decides where to curb them. For example, human desires are limitless. It is difficult indeed to set limits on the pursuit of fine clothes and delicious foods. But if one were to neglect his necessary business in an exclusive pursuit of his heart's desires, he would inevitably try to profit at the expense of others. This cannot be called a truly human course of action. At such a time it is the honest original mind which makes a distinction between desires and the truth, and prompts man to live within the truth.

e) Every man has a will, through which he can decide to act. For

example, things cannot be accomplished by chance. Good and evil are the results of the striving of the human will.

The above five characteristics are indispensable for being a true man. Man must utilize them freely to attain personal independence. When I say independence, it may seem that I am talking about some kind of eccentric and strange people who live in isolation from society. But this is hardly so. To live in the world as a human being one must have friends. But these friends in turn seek relationships with me, just as I seek their company. Therefore relations are mutual. But the most important thing is to obey the laws established by heaven, without overstepping one's limit and capacity, when one uses the above five qualities of man. By limit and capacity I mean that neither I nor another should use these qualities to infringe upon the activities of each other. Thus one can enjoy the esteem of both man and heaven if he can pass his life without overstepping his limits as a human being. This is what the rights of man are about.

The above argument sets down the principles whereby a man can conduct himself in freedom, as long as he does not infringe upon the rights of others. He can go as he pleases, work or play, engage in some business, study hard or, if that does not agree with him, loaf around the whole day long. Provided these actions do not affect others, there is no reason for men to censure them from the sidelines.

Now, let us suppose that there are some persons who oppose the above ideas. Their opinion may be that one should act in obedience to the will of others, irrespective of the right or wrong of things, and that it is not good to express one's own mind. How reasonable is this kind of argument? If it were reasonable, it should be universally valid for all men in the world. Let me illustrate. Since the emperor has greater dignity than the shogun, he should have been able to tell the shogun what to do, how to act, when to eat and sleep, etc., in a quite arbitrary manner as he so wished him to do. The shogun in turn should have coerced the daimyos below him; he should have freely dealt with them according to his own pleasure. The daimyos should have done the same to their vassals, these vassals to their stewards, these stewards to their attendants, these attendants to the *ashigaru*, and the *ashigaru* to the peasants, all the way down the line. But this argument is somewhat nonplussed when it comes to the peasants, for there are none below them. Yet it was supposed to be universally valid from the beginning, like the principle of 'revolving the *hyakumanben*[1] (one million times) rosary', which must always revolve

[1] 百万遍

full circle. The peasants are as much human beings as the emperor. Therefore what if the peasants do not hesitate to treat the emperor at will according to their own pleasure? For example, suppose they tell the emperor to stop when he wants to visit some place; they tell him to go back when he wants to go to his villa. Or suppose that the emperor's daily life was controlled by the arbitrary directives of the peasants, who deprive him of his fine clothes and substitute boiled barley for his delicious foods. In that eventuality, the Japanese would be a people who had the right to control others, but not to control themselves. It would be as if a person's body were a place to lodge another's soul; perhaps a strong drinker's soul in a non-drinker's body, or an old man's soul in a child's, or a robber's soul in Confucius's body, or a hunter's soul in Śākyamuni's. It would be as if a non-drinker had a good time drinking sake, while a strong drinker were satisfied in drinking warm sugared water; or an old man enjoyed climbing a tree, while a child walked with a stick and meddled in other people's business; or Confucius led his pupils to do robbery and Śākyamuni carried a gun and went out hunting. The results would be incongruous indeed! They would be strange, and unimaginable.

Shall we call this heavenly principle and human nature? Or civilization and enlightenment? Even a child of three could answer. From time immemorial the learning which the scholars of Chinese and Japanese Learning have expounded as the duties of both high and low have served to install someone else's soul into one's own body. They have been teaching this kind of thing, even admonishing people with tears, and their merits have gradually borne fruit in these degenerate days. As it has become customary for the strong to control the weak, the scholars too are showing faces of pride. The divinities of the age of the gods and the sages of Chou[2] must be resting happily in their graves. Let me take up one or two of their so-called meritorious teachings below.

I shall not repeat here my position in regard to the argument that a strong government should dominate over weak subjects. Let me here take up the question of the relations between men and women. In the first place, they are both born as human beings. They are both indispensable for social life. Their capabilities are about the same, but men are generally stronger than women. If a strong man fights a woman he will always win. In society, a person who steals by force or who puts another to shame is called a criminal, and is punished. Why, then, is it that a

2 周

man may openly put others to shame within the family without even being reproached for it?

In a book called *Onna daigaku*[3] there is enunciated a principle of 'triple obedience' for women: a) to obey her parents when young, b) to obey her husband when married, and c) to obey her children when old. It may be natural for a girl to obey her parents when she is young, but in what way is she to obey her husband after marriage? The book says that even if the husband is a drunkard or is addicted to sensual pleasures, or abuses and scolds her, and thus goes to the extreme of dissipation and lechery, the wife must still be obedient. She must respect her dissolute husband like heaven, and only protest to him with kind words and soft countenance. This is as far as the book goes. It says not a word about the outcome after this. It would therefore seem that its teaching is that as long as one has become a husband, his wife must obey him, even if he is dissolute or an adulterer, and no matter what her disgrace. She can only remonstrate with him with a gentle countenance, contrary to her real mind. The dissolute husband may follow her remonstrances or not. She is forced to consider her dissolute husband's mind as her fate. A Buddhist scripture says that 'Women are full of sins.' Indeed, from this point of view, women are from birth no other than criminals who have committed great crimes. At the same time, the book criticizes women severely and gives seven causes for divorcing a wife. It clearly states its reasons, and says that if she is lustful, it is grounds for divorce. This is very convenient for men. But it is entirely one-sided. In the last analysis, it is a teaching that sets up moral obligations between high and low, i.e. between men and women, on the basis of might makes right. For men are stronger than women.

The above-cited passages refer to adulterers and wanton women, but the book also has a discussion of concubines. By nature's decree, the number of male and female births seem to be about equal. According to some statistics in the West, more males are born than females, the proportion being 22 males to every 20 females. Accordingly, it is clearly against the law of nature when one husband has two or three wives. We should not hesitate to call such men beasts. Those who have a common father and mother are called brothers and sisters, and the place where parents and children live is called a home. But there are brothers who have a common father but different mothers. And the single father is independent, while the mothers constitute a group. Can we call this

[3] 女大学

a truly human home? It is not worthy of that name. Even if the house is many-storied and lofty, and the rooms are all beautiful, it is to me more like a shed for animals than a home for human beings. From ancient times we have never heard of a harmonious home with a plurality of wives. Even if a man keeps a secret mistress, she is a human being just the same. A person who uses a human being like a beast just for the pleasures of the moment, who disturbs the customs of the family and harms the education of his children and grandchildren, who spreads evils all over the country and leaves poison to future generations, must indeed be called a criminal.

Someone may counter that if a man supports a number of mistresses, there will be no violation of human nature if he treats them properly. This is the opinion of the man himself. If what he says were true, a woman should be allowed to support a number of husbands. She should be able to call them male concubines, and give them lower-ranking positions in the household. What then? If a woman could manage her household under such conditions without violating the great principle of human relations, I will stop my chattering arguments once and for all.

Men throughout the whole land should look into their own hearts. But someone may say that 'It is to acquire an heir that one supports a mistress. According to Mencius, there are three kinds of unfiliality to one's parents, and not to have an heir is the most unfilial.' To this I reply that any one who advocates ideas contrary to the natural law, even if he be Mencius or Confucius, should unhesitatingly be called a criminal. What a shame to marry a woman, and to call her most unfilial if she does not bear a child! Even if it is only a pretext, is it not terrible? What person with a human heart could believe this wild talk of Mencius?

In the first place, lack of filial piety means to do something that is against reason which displeases one's parents. Of course, the old are happy to have grandchildren, but this is no reason to call a person unfilial if a grandchild's birth is late. To the parents of the whole country I ask: when your son marries a good wife, do you get angry at her because she does not bear a child, and do you beat your son and wish to disown him? In this wide world there would be no queerer kind of parents. But these are all academic doctrines from the first, which are not worth answering. People can find the answers to these questions in their own hearts.

It is natural for a human being to be dutiful to his parents. Even strangers treat old persons with politeness. Much more should a son

love his parents. He should be filial to his parents, not for the sake of profit or name, but out of natural sincerity, simply because they are his parents. There are many stories in Japan and China from ancient times that encourage filial piety, beginning with the story of the twenty-four filial sons. But when we look at these stories, eight or nine out of ten encourage things which are too difficult to do, or things which are too foolish and ridiculous. Even worse, they sometimes praise things which are irrational as acts of filial piety. To lie on the ice in midwinter with no clothing on, and wait for the ice to melt—as one story has it—is impossible for a human being. Or instead of pouring sake over one's body on a summer evening to attract the mosquitoes away from one's parents—as another story has it—would it not be wiser to buy a paper mosquito net for the price of the sake? Or the man who buried his innocent child alive because he had no way to support his parents must have had the heart of a devil or viper. Such persons violate natural law and human nature.

We just saw that Mencius says there are three kinds of unfiliality, and that the most unfilial is not to have an heir. Now we read that a man, out of filial piety to his parents, tries to bury his child alive. Which is the real instance of filial piety? Or are they both not false theories and self-contradictory? In the last analysis, such theories which endeavor to clarify the duties between high and low end up excessively depreciating the child. They give such reasons as that the child has been a source of pain to the mother during pregnancy and childbirth, or that it cannot be separated from its parents for three years after birth. They therefore say that it owes a great debt of gratitude. But the birds and the beasts all bear young and support them. The only difference is that human parents must educate their children and teach them the ways of human life in addition to providing daily necessities.

Parents give birth to children easily enough, but they do not know the principles of educating them. The father indulges in dissipation, gives bad example to his children, and drags the family down into poverty and disgrace. He becomes stubborn as his spirit gradually declines and the family fortune shrinks away to nought. He then reproaches his dutiful son. What kind of a shameless scene is this? He is now craving after his son's money. The mother-in-law torments the heart of her daughter-in-law. Both elder parents control their son and his wife according to their own desires. The unreasonable parents are always right, the protests of the son are always wrong. The daughter-in-law is a slave the whole day through, as if she were in a hungry devil's hell. Whenever she does anything contrary to her husband's parents' wishes, she is called an

unfilial daughter. People may think this is unjust, but since it does not involve them personally, they side with the unreasonable parents. Or some persons advise the son to deceive his parents, regardless of right and wrong. Can we really call this the correct principles of family living? I once said that the mother-in-law should look back upon her younger days when she was a daughter-in-law and make it a good lesson. She ought to recall her own younger days, instead of tormenting her daughter-in-law.

I have given above two examples of the evil which results from the doctrine of subordination between high and low—first, in regard to the husband-and-wife relationship, and secondly, between parents and son. These evils are widespread in society. They influence every aspect of human intercourse. I shall give further examples of these abuses in the next section.

SECTION NINE

A LETTER TO AN OLD FRIEND IN NAKATSU STATING TWO WAYS OF LEARNING

CAREFULLY considering the mental and physical functions of man, I find that I can make the following division: the functions of the individual man, and the functions of man as a social being.

Let us call the former the functions of acquiring happiness in daily life through the powers of one's own body and mind. There is nothing in the universe which is not for man's use. If we plant a seed, it will produce fruit two hundred and three hundred times over. The trees in the heart of the mountains will grow even when they are not cultivated. The winds turn water mills. The seas carry cargoes of men and goods. Heavy boats or other vehicles can be propelled by the power of coal dug from the mountains, and by the power of water drawn from the rivers or seas to produce steam. Innumerable other things can be made with the creative force of nature, if they are skilfully employed. Man thus benefits by only slightly rechanneling the creative energies of nature. He adds only one percent to the ninety-nine percent of preparation already made by the hand of nature. Therefore we cannot say that man creates his daily necessities; it is rather as if he picks up these things strewn along the roadside.

Accordingly, man cannot boast that he provides for his daily necessities. Of course, an independent livelihood is of the greatest importance for a man. The ancients teach us that man should eat his food by the sweat of his brow. But my view is that even if he does so, he has still not fulfilled his duty as a man. This teaching only barely raises man up to the level of the birds and the beasts. Every animal provides for itself. Not only do they satisfy momentary needs; certain species, like ants, plan for their distant future by digging holes to make their nests, and storing up food for the winter. Indeed, there are people in the world who are satisfied with doing the work of ants.

Let me give an example. A man grows up to become an artisan, a tradesman, or a government official. He gradually outgrows his dependence on relatives or friends. He makes a reasonable living, without being

in debt to anyone. He builds a simple house, or rents one. Before it is completely furnished and stocked, he marries a young woman according to his wish. He settles down to a frugal life in which his many children receive an ordinary education. He always has a fund of thirty or forty yen in readiness for emergency and illness; he is anxious about planning to live a long and frugal life. At any rate, because he has the means to protect his household, he becomes proud of the fact that he has been able to earn an independent livelihood. Society also looks up to him as an independent and free man who has achieved some great thing. But this is in fact a great mistake. For this kind of person is only a pupil of the ant. His life work goes no further than that. He may have often worked or built his house with sweat on his forehead or anxiety in his heart. There may be nothing he should be ashamed of in the light of the teachings of the ancients. But despite his success, we cannot say that he has fulfilled the ideal of man as the lord of all creation.

If man could thus be satisfied with the mere acquisition of the necessities of life, life would mean only to be born into the world and to die. His condition at death would be no different than at his birth. If such a condition was transmitted to his children and grandchildren, a village would be eternally the same. No one would ever start public industries, or build boats and bridges. People would leave everything to nature except for immediate personal and family matters, with the result that there would be no trace of human activity anywhere. There is a saying in the West to the effect that if men were only content with small accomplishments, there would have been no progress in the world. This is indeed true. Of course, there are different kinds of satisfactions, which we must distinguish correctly. A person with an unsatiable desire to acquire more and more is guilty of greed or avarice. But a person who does not broaden his mental and physical powers to achieve his aims may be called ignorant and foolish.

Secondly, man is by nature social. Hardly anything can be done in complete isolation. Man's nature is not yet satisfied by the circle of spouse, parents, and children. He must have wider human associations in the community. The wider their associations, the more men feel fulfilment, and this is the reason that human intercourse begins. And with community life there must naturally be attendant responsibilities. What we call learning, industry, politics, law—these are all aimed at promoting social intercourse among men. Without social intercourse they lose their meaning. The government enacts laws for the precise purpose of protecting the good people from the bad, thereby making

human association possible. Scholars write books and educate others for the precise purpose of guiding the younger generation to be able to maintain human associations.

In ancient China it was said that ruling the country should be as impartial as chopping pieces of meat. It was also said that it was better to clean up the country than to remove weeds in the garden. These sayings describe the intentions of men who would endeavor to benefit human intercourse. A person should use his wealth to contribute to the general welfare. This is a constant principle of human nature. Even when a person does not consciously entertain humanitarian ideas, his descendants sometimes unconsciously inherit his virtues. It is because men have this social nature that they can fulfil their social obligations. If ancient people had not been such, we would not have the present advantages of civilization that we now enjoy. When a person inherits his parents' property, it is called a legacy. But this legacy merely includes a patch of land and household furnishings. They can be lost without trace. But the world's civilization is a legacy of a different sort. Each and every person receives a legacy from the human race as a whole. It is so tremendous that it cannot even be compared with land and household furnishings. But who is there to thank for these blessings? It is like receiving the sunlight and the air, so indispensable for life, without cost. For all its value, present owners should say that civilization is entirely due to the hidden virtue and generous gifts of the people of the past.

In the dawn of history men's intellects were not yet developed, just like infants. For example, ancient wheat harvests were turned into flour by being pounded with natural stones. Later, through someone's invention, two stones were made flat and round, with a small hole in the center of each. An axle of wood or metal was placed through one of the holes, and over this stone the other stone was placed. This let the axle of the lower stone pass through the hole of the upper stone. The wheat was placed between the stones and ground into flour as the heavy upper stone was turned around. In ancient times this stone mill was turned by hand, but in later ages the shape of the mill was gradually improved. More convenient methods, such as water wheels or wind wheels, were employed, and finally steam power was used.

This is true with everything else. The world improves by a gradual evolution, so that yesterday's advanced methods are soon old-fashioned. Last year's bright new ideas are commonplace by this year. Looking at the trend towards rapid progress in Western countries, we see that as soon as the telegram, steam power, and all sorts of instruments appear,

they are completely transformed into more and more novel forms. And it is not only the material things which are novel. The more man's knowledge develops, the wider his social intercourse becomes. And as his associations broaden, the closer become the bonds between men. One country cannot rashly wage war against another, for the rights of nations are guaranteed under international law. There will be a gradual and unlimited advance of civilization if there can be open economic discussions, radical transformation of political and business institutions, reformation of the school systems, the forms of books, government conferences, the debates of Diet members, etc. Take the history of any Western country and read about it from its beginning up to the 1600s. Then skip the next two hundred years, and pick up the story again from around 1800. So astonishing will have been the leap forward in that country's progress that we can hardly believe that it is the official history of the same country. Inquiring further into the cause of its progress, we will find that it has been due to the legacy and gifts of those who went before them.

Japanese civilization, too, first came from Korea and China. Japan's civilization then progressed to its present level through our own countrymen's indefatigable efforts. As for Western learning in Japan, it began as far back as the Hōreki period [1751–63]. (See the wood-block print book called *Rangaku kotohajime*).[1] In recent years intercourse with the foreigners began, and along with it, Western theories have been introduced to the people. Some Japanese have begun to teach Western learning and to translate Western works. There has been an increasing intellectual revolution; with it, political institutions have been renovated, and the feudal domains have been dismantled. At this present moment we are again making a new start in the direction of advanced civilization. We may say that this too is the legacy of the ancients, and the gifts of those who have blazed the trail before us.

I have said above that there have been not a few people who through their physical and mental labors contributed to the good of the world. These persons were not motivated by content with their own material abundance. They valued their social responsibilities, and set their sights on doing something noble. Present-day scholars have also received a civilized legacy from these people. Since they stand in the vanguard of modern progress, let them lead the way to higher and higher levels of civilization. Let future generations look back upon us to thank

[1] 蘭學事始

us for our legacy to them, just as we are grateful for the blessings of the past.

Generally speaking, our entire duty lies in living in this world today in such wise as to transmit the traces of our activities to our far-distant descendants. This is a grave responsibility. We cannot be satisfied with merely reading several volumes of school texts, or becoming businessmen, or artisans, or minor officials, just for the sake of several-hundred-yen salaries to be barely able to support our own families. This does others no harm, but it does them no good either. Moreover, one must act in a timely way. Even an influential person cannot exercise his power if he does not act at the right times. In my own home town I knew of a talented man of virtue and learning. He may have been lacking in certain ways from the point of view of modern civilization. But this was due to the conditions of his own times, not to his personal fault. He could have made a contribution, for he was full of energy to do things, but he never had the opportunity to do so. He therefore carried his treasures within himself and carried them to the grave. He was never able to give expression to his natural endowments and benefit the world. This was indeed regrettable.

But now times have changed. Western ideas have gradually come into use; the old regime was ultimately overthrown and the feudal clans dissolved. This should not be looked upon merely as the upheaval of war. The merits of civilization do not end with an ephemeral war. The real change has been a revolution in the public mind, stimulated by modern civilization. The upheaval of war has already ended seven years ago.[2] Its traces are no longer to be seen, but the effect on public feeling continues on. Generally speaking, things can be guided when they are moving. We must avail ourselves of the opportunity of the present moment to encourage learning and guide the public mind to higher levels of civilization. Since it is precisely we scholars who at the present time are presented with this opportunity, we must work very hard.

[2] Referring to the Meiji Restoration (1867–8); therefore this was written around 1874–5.

SECTION TEN

LETTER TO NAKATSU, CONTINUED

IN the former section, my argument divided the meaning of learning into two aspects. To generalize that argument, man cannot be satisfied with providing only for himself and his immediate family. There are higher bonds than this in human nature. Therefore a man must enter into communities of social life, and work for the good of society according to his capacity as one of its members.

He must elevate his ambition to pursue learning. Even cooking rice and lighting the fire under the bath are kinds of learning. Discourse on the affairs of state is another. Nevertheless, management of a single household is easier than the economics of the whole nation. As a rule, things which are easy to obtain are not highly valued in society. The reason why some things are valuable is that they are not easily obtainable. It seems to me that present-day scholars exhibit the vice of avoiding the difficult in favor of the easy path. In the feudal world, no matter how accomplished some scholars might have been, there was no way of putting their learning into practice, for the economy was rigid everywhere. Therefore, they were compelled to pursue more and more advanced learning. Their style of learning may not have been good, but their diligence and broad knowledge were superior to that of the scholars of today. Today's scholars can cash in quickly on what they know. For example, if a scholar of Western learning studies for three years, he acquires a general sort of knowledge of history and physics, sufficient to open up a school as a scholar of Western learning, to be hired by others, or be given some important post in the government. And there is an even easier path than these. If they read the current popular translations, or race off to learn the latest theories in society, both domestic and foreign, and then grasp the opportunity to become government officials, they become prestigious public servants! If such customs become the rule, learning will ultimately not advance to a high level.

I know that I should not write about vulgar things to a scholar, but let me give an example in terms of money. For one to study in a school, his expenses will not exceed one hundred yen a year. Thus if he invests

three hundred yen for three years to get training as a scholar of Western learning, he can later gain a profit of fifty or seventy yen per month. Since a person who, if he learns by experience, does not even make this three hundred yen investment, his monthly gain will all be net profit. Is there such great profit in the business world? Even a usurer cannot compete with this rate of gain. Of course, since the price of things depends on supply and demand, and nowadays the government and all other quarters are clamoring for such scholars of Western learning, this favorable business climate has resulted. Therefore we cannot positively brand these men as crafty businessmen. Nor are we criticizing those who hire them as fools. But, in my opinion, if these men were truly made to work at practical learning through three to five additional years of grueling studies, and only thereafter given appointments, they might achieve something very fine. And only by elevating the intellectual and moral levels of the whole nation in this exacting way will we reach the point of being able to compete with Western civilization.

What, then, should be the goals of scholars today? Does it not lie in seeking the great principles of independence, and in reviving the rights of self-autonomy and freedom? And freedom and independence already imply responsibilities. Independence does not consist exclusively in dwelling in one's own house and not depending on others for food and clothes. This is merely a domestic responsibility. Men can be said to have fulfilled both internal and external obligations only if they do not bring disgrace upon the name of Japanese citizens, and if they strive together with their countrymen to secure the free and independent status of Japan as a world nation. Therefore, one who barely provides for his own food and clothing within his own house may be called the independent master of his own house, but not an independent Japanese citizen.

When I survey the contemporary scene, I see the external traces of civilization, but not its inner substance. There are the outward forms, but not the inner spirit. Can we now pit our army and navy against the arms of the West? Can we now teach the West with our techniques of scholarship? On the contrary, we must learn these things from abroad, fearing only that we have not yet reached their levels. We send students abroad, but when it comes to hiring teachers in Japan, they are generally all foreigners, from government offices and schools down to the prefectures and the ports. Even private companies and schools, when they plan some new undertaking, must first hire foreigners and rely on them at the cost of excessive salaries. People say that Japan is just using their

talents to make up for our deficiencies. But if we look at present conditions, it seems that the deficiencies are all on our side, and the talents all on theirs. Of course, since we have just suddenly had intercourse with the civilized nations after several hundred years of national seclusion, our situation is like mixing fire and water. To balance this relationship, foreign teachers and goods are being imported to make up for present urgent needs and calm down the seething turmoil. Since it is unavoidable anyhow, dependence on their temporary supplies cannot be said to be an error for Japan.

Nevertheless, while we may comfort ourselves that meeting the needs of Japan by depending on the West is only a temporary expediency, when will this temporary policy come to an end? How will methods be acquired so that we will be independent of the West and can supply our own needs? They will be extremely hard to come by. Our only recourse is to wait for the achievements of today's scholars to reach a point where they can meet Japan's needs. The scholarly professions have already taken this urgent responsibility upon themselves. The foreigners employed within Japan must retain their posts as substitutes for a short period until our own scholars are mature. Foreign goods must also be temporarily imported in exchange for cash until Japan's own industries are sufficiently developed. The funds spent to import men and goods from abroad is money lost to the foreigners since Japanese scholarship is not yet on a par with theirs. Men should have regrets for the sake of the nation, and as scholars they should have a sense of shame. But, as men, they must also have high goals for the future. Without goals, nothing can be accomplished in life. We should therefore comfort ourselves during the present misfortune by looking to tomorrow's potential blessings. We must endure this year's suffering by looking to next year's happiness.

In former times, all the areas of life were constrained by the ancient system, so that even a scholar with a will had no scope to fulfil his ambitions. Today it is different. A new world is opening up before scholars, now that restrictions have been removed. There is no area in society to which he cannot devote his energies. There are hundreds of things to be done—farming, business, scholarship, government life, writing books, writing for newspapers, giving lectures on law, studying the techniques of learning, developing industries, opening the Diet chambers, etc. Moreover, our motive need not be mutual struggle between brothers, but intellectual competition with the West. If we are victorious in this battle, Japan's position will be enhanced; if vanquished, her prestige will decline. Our hopes must be high, and our aims clear. Of course, the

priorities of the affairs of the nation will vary with conditions. But people must begin to use their talents to study the absolutely indispensable things from now on. People who realize their social obligations to any degree must not stand by as indifferent onlookers in today's world. Scholars must especially apply all efforts.

Scholars can hardly be satisfied with ordinary school educations. They must elevate their sights to understand the true worth of learning. They must be autonomous and independent. If they have no friends of kindred minds, they should cultivate their spirit alone to preserve Japan, and thereby devote their efforts for the sake of society. I do not cherish the fact that old-style scholars of Japanese and Chinese Learning know how to govern others, but not how to govern themselves. Precisely because I do not, I advocated the doctrine of the equal rights of man from the beginning of this work, and have been discussing the position that persons must take responsibility for their own affairs, and the importance of relying on their own power. But the significance of learning cannot be exhausted only by providing for oneself. This would be like a dissolute and villainous child for whose proper upbringing certain methods must be employed. His drinking and life of pleasure must first be prohibited before he can be given responsibilities of any importance. But we cannot call it virtue simply because he has put off these vices. He has stopped doing harm to society, but he is still a useless fellow. Only after stopping these vices, taking on some job, cultivating his person, and bringing profit to his household can he be called an average fellow.

The same argument applies to providing only for oneself. Persons from the samurai families and above have been accustomed to old ways for thousands of years. They do not know the value of clothing and food. Having no idea of how wealth is acquired, they haughtily, and without efforts on their own part, are well provided for, and they think that it is their natural privilege as well. Their condition is generally like the dissolute son. What can I say to such people? I can only advocate my doctrine of providing for oneself to shake them out of their drunken dreams. Should I try to exhort them to pursue learning of a high level? Should I explain to them the great principle of contributing to society? Even if I tried to, since it will enter within their knowledge in their present dream-like state, it will only be a dream within a dream. This is the reason why I chiefly advocate the doctrine of providing for oneself, and do not urge true learning on them. Accordingly, this doctrine of mine was aimed mainly at those who lead lives of idleness. It was not an admonition to scholars. But I hear that among my old friends in Nakatsu,

some persons who pursued a career of learning have gone only half way and then given it up to make their livelihood. Making a livelihood must also not be belittled, of course. I can approve of the fact that they are deciding their future course of life on the basis of their own talents. But I fear that if people imitate such customs and only compete for livelihood, their fine promise as youths will fail to bear full fruit. This is regrettable for both the boys and the nation as well. Livelihood is difficult to come by, but if they plan the management of their households well, it is better to expend one's efforts, be frugal, and look to the time of great accomplishment, than to earn money quickly to buy minor happiness. If they follow a career as scholars, they must study to the utmost. If they become merchants or farmers, let them be great ones; similarly, if they become scholars, let them not be satisfied with learning of small consequence. Let them not be deterred by heat or cold, by coarse clothes and poor foods; let them pound rice and cut wood. They can pursue learning even as they pound rice. Moreover, the foods of man are not limited to Western-style menus. Let them study the matters of civilization while they eat boiled barley and drink *miso* soup.

SECTION ELEVEN

THE FALSITY OF THE IDEA OF MORAL SUBORDINATION

IN Section Eight I gave examples of harm done to women and children through the concept of the moral subordination of inferiors to superiors. I noted many such abuses that extend even outside of the family. To take up, in the first place, the origin of this theory, its form certainly is reducible to the principle of might makes right. But it does not necessarily arise from evil intentions. It consists rather in regarding the people as ignorant beings who are easy to control, i.e. who should be succored and guided by their total subservience to the commands of their superiors, who are to handle all matters according to their own discretion. The minds of superiors and inferiors are supposed to be in perfect unison on the national level, the village level, or in a shop or household. All human relations are to be treated after the parent-child relation. For example, in dealing with children of about ten years of age, they should not, of course, be allowed to decide things for themselves. They should be clothed and fed according to the judgements of their parents. Only if their children are obedient should they have warm clothing in cold weather and good food when hungry. Food and clothing will then be in abundance as if rained down from heaven. The children will have these things when they need them, and thus live with complete freedom and security of mind. Since parents love their children even more than themselves, the instructions and discipline, encouragements and scoldings which they give their children will spring from loving affection. The relation between parents and children will be very close, and their joy will be beyond compare. In other terms, their union will fulfil the moral relationship that is quite appropriate to this case.

The advocates of the theory of moral subordination make an interesting case for applying the parent-child relation to all human relations. But there are grave objections to this. The parent-child relation can only be one between real parents, whose wisdom is mature, and their own immature children. It is impossible for the same relation to prevail with another person's child. Again, when their own child grows up to over twenty years of age, the parents must change their attitudes towards

the child. Still more is this so in the case between adult strangers. It is impossible that this latter relationship be based on the same principle. It is what is called 'easier said than done'. Indeed, nation, village, government, or business companies are all relations between grown-ups and between strangers. Will it not be difficult to apply the principle of parent-child relationship here? Yet the fancy that it would be good to try seems to be a constant tendency of human nature. This is the reason why the theory of moral obligations based on the parent-child relation emerges in society, and the reason why tyranny has subsequently been practiced. Therefore, I say that the source of the idea of stratified moral relationships does not necessarily derive from evil intentions, but has perforce been the product of such fancies.

In the countries of Asia, the ruler has been called the parent of the people, the people have been called his subjects and children. In China, the work of the government has been called the office of shepherd of the masses, and local officials were called the shepherds of such-and-such provinces. Since this word *boku*[1] means to feed animals, it had the connotation of treating the people of single provinces as cows or sheep, and that name was publicly written on the notice boards. Was this not an extremely discourteous way of saying and doing things? Even so, the word originally did not necessarily have such an evil meaning. It had something like the idea of the care of children by their parents. First, the ruler was described as a sage and enlightened man; then, wise and virtuous officials were employed to assist him. These leaders were without any selfishness of mind or the slightest personal desires. They were pure as water, and straightminded as an arrow. They extended their own affection to the people, whom they cherished and loved. In times of famine they gave them food; in the event of fires they gave them money. Thus they relieved them in their sufferings, so that the people could enjoy peace and happiness in their daily lives. The moral influence of the superior class was as redolent as the fragrance which the south wind brings. The people, in turn, submitted like the grasses bending in the breeze. Or their docility was like soft cotton. Their innocence was like wood and stones. Superiors and inferiors could then sing of the great harmony in perfect unison. All this was the original intention of the theory. Indeed, it was an imitation of the conditions of paradise.

Nevertheless, if we consider the facts more deeply, the relation between government and people is not that of flesh and blood. It is in essence an

[1] 牧, 'shepherd'.

association of strangers. Personal feelings cannot be the guiding principle in an association between strangers. It is necessarily based on the creation of a social contract. Even when they dispute over minute points of interpretation, this too contributes to a larger social order and good government. And for this reason national laws are created. It may be essential to have the above hierarchy of enlightened ruler, excellent ministers, and docile people, but by entering what schools can such faultless sages be created? By what educational process can such splendid citizens be obtained? The Chinese have in fact been concerned with these ideas since the Chou dynasty. But from the Chou to the present there never has been a time of peace and good government based on those essential ingredients. Has not the upshot been that China has been oppressed by foreigners, as witnessed again today? Not seeming to learn the significance of this, they are like persons who swallow the same inefficacious medicines over and over again. They employ an extremely artificial concept of 'benevolent government'. These sages, who were not divine, would endeavor to blend injustice with benevolent government, and thus force blessings upon the people. But when blessings turn into burdens, and virtuous rule changes into harsh laws, do they still sing of the great harmony? If they desire to sing, let them sing alone. No one will join them any more. For their original intention was itself too wide of the mark. China may be our close neighbor, but her situation is unendurably ridiculous.

This kind of behavior is not limited to the relation with the government. It is universal—in merchant houses, schools, the shrines and temples. Let me give just one example. In a business shop, the master is supposed to be the expert in all things. He alone handles the ledger. Then there are the clerks and assistants, who, while concentrating on their own tasks, do not know the management of the whole business. They only do the will of their noisy and blustering boss, who dictates their salary and their tasks. They cannot tell how the business is going from looking in the ledger. Day and night they just look at their master's expressions. They can only surmise that the business is going well if he is cheerful, or suppose it is not when he is gloomy. They themselves have no other cares, except secretly to manipulate the books which they have charge of in order to embezzle funds. Even the eagle-eyed boss does not catch what is going on. Although he thought that a certain servant[2] was completely trustworthy, when the records are checked after he absconds

[2] The name Chūsuke is used, playing on the literal meaning of 'loyal servant'.

or suddenly dies, the books show that he has gouged out a hole of embezzled money as big as a cave. Only then does the master of the shop sigh over how untrustworthy men are. But the cause does not lie there. It comes from his own original despotism over all things. Since he and the servant were adults who were completely unrelated to one another, the cause of the trouble can be said to have been due to his own bad attitude of not promising a fairer share of the business to him, whom he in fact treated like a child.

This kind of poisonous atmosphere creates the sick condition of swindling and subterfuge prevalent among men because of the above stress on moral subservience practiced in an exclusive and tyrannical way. I call people who are infected with this sickness false gentlemen. In the feudal age, for example, the retainers of a daimyo were all on the surface loyal retainers. In outward form, they were true to those moral relations between superiors and inferiors. They performed every act of deference to their lord and kept their prescribed distances. At the anniversary of his death they observed abstinence. At the birthday of a young lord they wore ceremonial dress. At the New Year observances and visits to the grave of his ancestors, no one was absent. According to their own way of saying it, 'poverty was the constant way of the warrior,' or 'loyalty and patriotism', or 'sacrifice one's life for one's lord'. They made such statements of great dedication that in times of crisis they had the spirit to rush off to die in battle. Ordinary people may be taken in by all this, but if we quietly consider it from another point of view, they were, as might be expected, false gentlemen.

For if there was a retainer or a daimyo who discharged his office well, why was it that his family became rich? With a fixed hereditary stipend and wages for his office, there was no reason for him to have even one sen of extra income. It was therefore very strange that he should have money left over after balancing out income and expenses. It was certain that he had cheated his lord out of his money, whether through perquisite or bribery. I will give some conspicuous examples of this, as follows. It seems to have been almost a regular rule in the families of the three hundred feudal lords that the head official in charge of construction would demand a pay-back from the carpenters; and the finance officials took presents from the merchants under their patronage. Was it not extremely improper for loyal retainers who had pledged even to die for their lord by risking their lives in front of his horse to take commissions for buying things? They should be called false gentlemen plated superficially with gold. Some rare honest official might gain a reputation in the

domain for being above bribery. But he was in fact only doing his job without stealing. It is no cause for praise just because one has not set his heart on robbery. He who is an ordinary person becomes conspicuous only by contrast with the rest, who are false gentlemen. In the last analysis, the cause of the abundance of those false gentlemen was the ancient wild fancy that the people of the land were all good and easily controlled. This error finally led to despotism and oppression. The dog ultimately bit his master's hand. Indeed, the theory of moral subservience is the most unreliable one in the whole world, just as the worst poison is despotism. They are indeed horrible.

Some may say that the examples of evil people's insincerity are limitless, but not all people are like this; Japan has been a just country, in which from ancient times there have been many examples of loyal retainers who have given their lives for their lords. To this I answer that so it was. We have not been without examples of loyal retainers since ancient times. But their number has been so small that the accounts do not tally. The Genroku period, for example, can be called the period when the flower of chivalry was in full bloom. At that time there were forty-seven loyal samurai in the Akō clan with its 70,000 *koku* income. In a domain of 70,000 *koku* there were about 70,000 people. If there were forty-seven in 70,000 there should have been about four thousand seven hundred in seven million. But chivalry also declined with the changing of the seasons of history, as people also say, and truly, too. Therefore deducting thirty percent from the supposed chivalry of the Genroku period, for seven million people the proportion should be about 70% of 4,700, which is 3,290. If the present population of Japan is about 30,000,000, the number of loyal people should be 14,100. A child of three can calculate that this number is not enough to protect present-day Japan.

According to my above arguments, the concept of moral subservience has been an utter failure. Let me say a few more words on the subject. *Meibun*,[3] or the theory of moral subservience, is an empty concept, but the concepts of 'high' and 'low' are equally useless. But if these ostentatious names and the actual responsibilities truly corresponded, and people really fulfilled their duties, I do not think I would have any objection to them. That is, the government is the country's counting room, and has the duty to rule the people. The people are the country's financiers, and have the duty to support the government. The duty of civil officials is to confer and decide upon the laws of the government. The duty of mili-

[3] 名分, a Confucian idea of moral obligation according to one's 'name' or station.

tary officers is to go out and fight according to their commands. There are set duties for scholars and merchants, besides. But if an upstart of superficial learning hears that his duties were unnecessary and forgets them, or breaks the law as a citizen; or if the government meddles with private industry; or if soldiers discuss politics and start wars on their own; or if civil officials submit to brute force and obey the command of military officers—if such things should happen, the country will be in great turmoil. There will be anarchy and lawlessness that are caused by superficial knowledge of independence and freedom. *Meibun* or 'moral subservience' and *shokubun*[4] or 'one's duty' may look alike in written characters, but they are completely different in meaning. Scholars should not misunderstand this distinction.

[4] 職分

SECTION TWELVE

I AN ENCOURAGEMENT OF PUBLIC SPEAKING

ENZETSU is called 'speech' in English. It is a style of expressing one's views at a large assembly of people. This kind of thing has since ancient times never existed in Japan, except perhaps for preaching done in temples. But it is very popular in the West. From the parliament of a government, the meetings of scholars, business companies, and gatherings of citizens, down to ceremonial occasions and even trivial matters such as the opening of a shop, there is a custom that whenever there is a gathering of ten or more people, some person always makes a speech about the meeting or the purpose of the meeting, or utters some pet theory, or expresses some impromptu ideas. People communicate with one another in this way. It is beyond doubt that this is a very important practice. For example, people are now saying that Japan should have a parliament. But it will serve no purpose unless there is a method of expounding ideas in the first place.

Setting aside the question of whether a given subject is important or not, one who expresses his views through public speaking can produce a certain good effect. For example, something which was not so significant in a written text can become easily understood and impressive if said in words. This is true of famous poems from ancient and modern times. If put in ordinary prose form, these poems would lose their interest. But when they are well structured according to the rules of poetry, they become extremely charming and moving. Accordingly, the rapid transmission of one's ideas to the public has a great deal to do with the method of its transmission.

It is not necessary to reiterate here that learning does not consist only in the reading of books. The essence of learning lies rather in its practical application, without which learning is still ignorance. In the past, there was a student of Chu Hsi philosophy who studied for many years in Tokyo, copying out theories of the different masters on the schools of learning. By his long, day-and-night labors he piled up several hundred volumes in several years' time. Having thus completed his studies, he decided to return to his home in the west along the Tōkaidō. He therefore

packed up his copied books in arrowroot baskets, and shipped them on ahead. But unfortunately the ship was wrecked in the Sea of Enshū. When he returned to his native province, he found out that all his learning had been washed away with the waves. He was back exactly where he started, in a state of total ignorance. The same danger exists for the present crop of Japanese scholars of Western learning. Because they now read and lecture in the city schools, we cannot help calling them scholars. But if circumstances suddenly took away their sources and forced them back to the rural areas, they might have to make the excuse to their relatives and friends: 'I have left my learning back in Tokyo.'

Therefore the essence of learning lies in the activity of one's mind, not in the mere reading of books. There must be all kinds of means to put this activity to practical use. The word 'observation' means the perceiving of things, and 'reasoning' means the inferring of the principles of things and giving one's own views on the matter. But neither exhausts the methods of learning. It is also necessary to read and write books, converse with others, and present your opinions to the public. A person may be called a true scholar only when he has made use of all these means. Observation, reasoning, and reading are the means through which knowledge is gathered; conversation the means of its exchange; reading and public speaking the means of the diffusion of learning. Some of these a person can do by himself, but conversation and public speaking require a larger community. From this we can see how important public speaking is.

The most lamentable thing about the Japanese people today is that their views are not lofty. Therefore, since it is the first duty of scholars to guide them to higher views, they must avail themselves of whatever means they can command for doing so. It is demonstrable that conversation and public speaking are essential to the pursuit of learning, but why do people not actually use them? It is because of the indolence of scholars. In human affairs, both private and public aspects exist, and both of them are necessary. But many scholars are exclusively absorbed in private matters. A true scholar must, when alone, be as silent as deep water, but among people he must be as active as a flying bird; he must be deeply introspective, yet at the same time be boundless in public activities.

II THE REFINEMENT OF MORAL CHARACTER

I have just said that the most lamentable thing about the Japanese people today is that their views are not lofty. And I am not merely

referring to lofty principles. The Zen sect preaches a way of spiritual enlightenment, the principle of which is said to be very recondite. But as we look at the monks' activities, we see that they are so remote as to be of no practical use. In fact, their ideas are vague to the point of being no opinions at all.

Again, one's views and conduct must not be lofty only in the breadth of experience. There are people who do not possess definite views of their own despite reading thousands of books and a wider association with others. They are the Confucian scholars who cling to old customs. The scholars of Western learning are addicted to the same vice. There are people today who follow the ever advancing learning of the West. They read books on economics, or lecture on moral theories, or concentrate their energies night and day on metaphysics and epistemology. When one is sitting atop bristling thorns, one ought not be insensible to their sting. But as far as I can see, the private lives of these people give no evidence of the effects of all this effort. Their knowledge of economics has no influence on their family business. Their knowledge of moral theories has no bearing on their own moral cultivation. As talkers and doers they seem to be two entirely different persons. I cannot find anyone with his own definite views.

Even if we do not go so far as to condemn their words and actions as wrong, there is a complete discrepancy between what they say is right and what they actually practice. They sometimes practice what they preach, but to them can often be applied the sayings that 'A physician neglects his own health,' and 'Some people can read the *Analects* of Confucius but do not understand it.' Therefore lofty opinions and conduct refer neither to expounding profound principles nor to breadth of knowledge taken in an exclusive sense.

How, then, can a person's views be elevated to influence his conduct? The secret lies in comparing the conditions of things and setting one's sights on higher standards without ever becoming complacent. But this means to compare, not single details, but one total system of conditions with another, and to pass judgement on the relative merits of the alternatives. Suppose that there is a schoolboy who has worked hard, without indulging in dissolute pleasures. He will not be reproached by his parents or elders, and most likely feels proud of himself. But he has reason for pride only in comparison with some other rascals. Diligence and good behavior are what were expected of him, and are not worthy of special praise. He should have even nobler aspirations in life.

A person must set before his mind's eye the achievements of the

great men of past and present, and pick out the one whose deeds he shall strive to emulate. He must always take persons of higher attainment as his standards. He should not be satisfied with his own one talent when he sees two talents in others. This is all the more true since later progress will inevitably surpass earlier progress, making the past void. Today's responsibilities are greater than those in the past. However, we cannot think that diligence and good conduct are the sole aims of human life. A life of dissolution is animal; to pride oneself in comparison with that would merely be boasting of one's sight before a blind man. It would only be a useless display of stupidity. Therefore an argument is still on a low level if it is about the pros and cons of dissolute conduct. As one's conduct improves, he will soon leave such stupid talk behind him, so that even discussion of the matter will become detestable.

In their criticism of schools today, parents are solely concerned with the control of public morals. But what does the phrase 'public morals' mean? It must mean strict observance of school regulations, and thorough discipline over the student's moral life. But these things are completely beside the point for an academic institution. Public morals in Western schools are by no means all good. Many of them, on the contrary, are very bad. But I have never heard of a reputation of a school being based on correct morals and thorough control of discipline.

The reputation of a school depends only on the excellent quality of the subjects of study, the skill of the teachers, the refinement of the people, and the high quality of their discussions. Therefore, both administrators and students should not compare their schools with inferior schools, but with schools of finer quality. The moral conduct and discipline of a school may be counted among its merits, but this is the least important aspect of a school, and not worth boasting about. They should make even greater efforts, if they want to compare favorably with schools of higher academic quality. Accordingly, the urgent business of a school is to consider its academic level, and not just be satisfied with its moral conduct and discipline.

The same principle can be applied to the conditions of a country. Suppose that a given administration is run by wise, virtuous, and irreproachable men. Since they understand the joys and sorrows of the people, they take proper measures to reward the meritorious and punished the wicked. They exhibit both mercy and severity. The people are healthy and enjoy the fruits of peace. But rewards and punishments, mercy and severity, peace and prosperity are all domestic affairs under the control of one or only a handful of administrators. They can

have reason to take pride only in comparison of present conditions with some former administration or some evil government. This is hardly to make a detailed and thoroughgoing comparison with another country. If one nation as a whole is compared with another civilized country over several decades, it may be that the relative accomplishments of one nation will not be worth especially boasting about.

Take, for example, the national structure of India, which dates back several thousand years. The subtlety and abstruseness of its philosophies are probably not inferior to the philosophies of the modern West. The ancient Turkish government, too, was most prestigious. In ritual, music, the arts of war, there was nothing that was not well organized. The rulers were wise; court officials were irreproachable. Its teeming population and brave soldiers were superior to its neighboring countries, so that for a while it won universal fame. Therefore, if we make comments on India or Turkey, we must say that the former was once a famous center of civilization and the latter was a great military empire.

Yet India is now a colony of Great Britain, and her people are slaves of the British government. Their only business is to produce opium to poison the Chinese, while the British merchants reap the profits from the opium trade. Turkey too, while nominally independent, has become a monopoly of British and French business interests. Its national products decline day by day, as a result of the free trade. Its people no longer weave cloth or make looms. Either they cultivate the land with sweat on their brows, or they loaf about idly all day. They rely entirely upon British and French imports for all manufactured articles. There are no means to manage the economy of the country, and it is said that no matter how brave her soldiers may be, they are of no use because they are restrained by poverty.

Now, why is it that Indian culture and Turkish military heritage have not benefited the civilizations of each? The reason is that the minds of their peoples were turned complacently in on themselves. When they compared themselves with other nations, they took only a partial look, and were thus deceived by the seeming balance of potentials between nations. So their discussions ended there. They did not compare themselves with another country's total resources and conditions. Therefore while their people enjoyed peace or quarrelled domestically, other nations passed them by, and then came to oppress them with the power of modern commerce. The merchants of the West were without rivals wherever they went. They are certainly to be feared for their business prowess. But if people admire their own civilization, they should strive to the best of their powers to catch up with them in every respect.

SECTION THIRTEEN

THE DAMAGE OF RESENTMENT

OF the many human vices, none is more vicious than resentment. Greed, luxury, and defamation are other notable vices, but properly considered, they are not vices in the quality of the actions themselves. Circumstances sometimes neutralize them as vices, i.e. their degree and purpose are contributing factors. For example, greed is an insatiable love of money, but love of money is a part of human nature. There can hardly be blame if a person satisfies this love in accordance with human nature. Only if he mistakes its proper place by seeking to gain money by unjust means, and thereby oversteps the principle and purpose of the possession of money, can it be called the vice of greed. Therefore we cannot immediately label it a vice every time we come across a mind which appreciates money. A certain principle lies at the borderline of virtue and vice. Those who remain within this borderline can be called frugal and economical. Indeed, such an attitude is one of the excellent virtues for which men should strive.

It is the same with luxury. It becomes a virtue or vice depending entirely on how far it goes. It is human nature to want to wear warm clothes and live in a safe house. How can it be called a vice to comfort oneself according to human nature? To accumulate and spend, but to spend without going beyond the proper limits, may also be called one of the finer virtues of man.

Again, there is hardly any difference between defamation and public refutation of another. To distort another person's statements maliciously is called defamation; to state what one thinks to be the truth by resolving another's contradictions is called refutation. Hence as long as the public road of truth has not yet been found, discussions between men cannot be determined as either good or bad. Until right and wrong are determined, we may say that public opinion should be made the truth, but it is extremely difficult to clarify just what public opinion is. Therefore we cannot immediately call it slander when we see one person attacking another. In fact, it is necessary to seek the truth all over the

world in order to distinguish whether it was slander or true refutation.

In addition to the above, arrogance and bravery, coarseness and frankness, stubbornness and steadiness, levity and sharpness are all relative opposites. They become virtues or vices only by the circumstances, degree, and purpose of each act. It is only resentment which is a vice through and through, regardless of circumstance or purpose.

For resentment is a completely negative thing. It is a discontent with the conditions of another, and demands too much from another, without reflecting upon oneself. Such a means to gratify one's discontent does one's self no good, and harms the other as well. For example, comparing one's own bad luck with another's good fortune, one does not seek a means to better his own condition, but downgrades the condition of the other and thereby seeks to bring the other down to his own level—what you might call hating another and wishing his death. Therefore to feed this discontent only by depreciating the fortunes of others can be of no positive value at all.

Some men say that deception and lies rank with resentment for being evil in essence. I reply that while this may seem to be so, they cannot be put in the same category if their causes and results are distinguished. Deception and lies are, of course, great evils, but they are rather the results than the causes of resentment. Resentment is, as it were, the mother of a whole brood of vices. Suspicion, jealousy, fear, cowardice are all its offspring. It appears inwardly in the forms of furtive talk, whispering, confidential remarks, secret intrigues; outwardly it assumes the destructive forms of cliques, assassinations, rebellions, civil wars. They bring not the slightest benefit to the nation. No one escapes from the trouble which they bring in their wake. They can be called promoting one's own private interests at the public expense.

Such is the damage caused by resentment. Now to consider its causes, it lies in a kind of impasse which people get into. This is not an impasse in financial matters. It is something which drives man's natural functions to extremity by impeding human communication and enterprise. If financial distress were the cause of resentment, the poor of the nation would all be complaining of injustice, the rich and noble would be the focus of their wrath, and human intercourse would not last a single day. But this is not the actual fact. Even the poorest of people, if they realize that the causes of their poverty and low station lie in themselves, do not recklessly vent their resentment on others. This is evident from the fact that men preserve social relations despite the differences between rich and poor, high and low. Therefore I say that wealth and high station

are not the objects of anger in themselves, nor are poverty and low station necessary causes of discontent.

Resentment is accordingly not produced by poverty and low station. Rather it thrives in conditions where man's natural functions are blocked and all human fortunes are considered accidental. Confucius once sighed and said that it was difficult to deal with women and small-minded men. But now as I see it, I must say that this was a situation which Confucius himself brought about, and he himself is displaying this vice. For there is no principle in terms of which human nature can be different according to sex. Again, when he spoke of small-minded men, did he mean inferior persons? The children of the lowly are not necessarily inferior, and needless to say, there are no innate distinctions between noble and inferior. But why, then, was Confucius troubled only by women and small-minded people? This was because Confucius taught that people in general were inferior. He thus bound the weak women and lowly people, and did not allow them any freedom of behavior. Therefore, a spirit of resentment was being created, and when it reached an extreme, even Confucius had to lament about it.

When a person's nature cannot find free expression, he will inevitably become resentful of others. The law of cause and effect is as clear as barley growing from barley seeds. Confucius may have had the reputation of being a sage, but he did not understand this principle. It was quite untrustworthy of him simply to complain about the stupidity of others without doing anything constructive about it. Of course, since Confucius lived in an age of barbarism over two thousand years ago, he must have followed the custom of the time and knowingly resorted to the expedient of binding men to preserve lofty human sentiment in his own day. But if Confucius were a true sage whose wisdom provided insight for all times, he would not have been dissatisfied with the expedient teaching of that time. And therefore those who study Confucius in later times must deal with his thought selectively, by taking the ideas of his time into account. Those who would apply unchanged to Meiji Japan the teachings of two thousand years ago do not know the true value of things.

Let me give an example closer to our own times. Of those who were filled with the poison of resentment and did the most harm to human relations, the worst were the many ladies in the castles of the feudal lords of Japan. Generally speaking, the palaces were packed with ignorant and unlettered females who served a single ignorant and unvirtuous lord. Study went unrewarded, indolence unpunished; remonstrance produced

no reaction; it was irrelevant whether one spoke out or remained silent, whether one told the truth or not. The only thing that mattered was whether they had the good luck to be in the lord's favor and affection by adapting themselves to the changing circumstances which each new day brought. It was like shooting a bow without a target; to hit or miss the target was not a matter of skill. They may be said to have lived in another world in which their natures were bound to change and make them different from the rest of society. When some lady established herself in the lord's favor through her contacts, the others could only envy her since there was no way to study the method by which she established herself. In the excess of their envy, they could only seethe with jealousy.

Since they were so burning with jealousy and resentment, what time did they have to consider the good of the house? Their loyalty was a pronouncement in name only. But in actual fact, even if they spilled oil on the mat floor, they would leave it there without wiping it up if no one saw it. Even worse, when the lord was mortally sick, they were so entangled in glaring daggers of hate at one another that many could not even care for their sick lord, even though they wished to. But the most vicious extreme of resentment and jealousy was when they sometimes took the form of poisoning. If we were statistically to compare the ratios of poisonings in the castles of old and in modern times, we would clearly see how much more prevalent poisoning was in the feudal castles. It would serve to prove how terrible the harm of resentment is.

I think that we can infer the general condition of society even from this one example of the castle ladies. Resentment is the worst of human ills. Therefore, since the causes of resentment lie in a kind of spiritual impasse, the avenues of human expression must be opened. People must be given the opportunity to give free rein to their talents. Let us compare conditions in England or America with Japan. Let us pose the question: Which country, in its social relations, was most removed from the above-described situation of the feudal castles? I am not implying that Japan's situation was exactly equal to the above case, but if the point is the relative distance from it, Japan is closer to it than England or America. It is not that the English and Americans are not covetous and extravagant, or coarse and disruptive, or false and deceitful. Their manners and customs are not all good either; but when it comes to concealing resentment, they differ in mentality from the Japanese. Nowadays, intellectuals are talking about the need of a Diet elected by the people and about freedom of the press. Passing over the relative merits of their arguments, their basic reason lies in wanting to make Japan different from the castles

of old, and to make the Japanese people different from the castle ladies. They want to replace resentment with action, to put a stop to resentment by encouraging free competition, to win fame and fortune through their own efforts. They want to make the people of the whole country reap what they have sown.

The obstruction of free expression and free enterprise among the people is generally considered a political question. If one suddenly heard talk of this question, he might ascribe it exclusively to the defects of the government. But this kind of sickness is not limited to government only. It has infected the people as well with extremely harmful results. Hence it cannot be cured only by reform of government. Let me say a few more words about this problem outside of government at the end of this section.

Man is by nature a social animal; he can come to dislike society only through the force of habit. There are eccentric and odd persons who purposely cut themselves off from society by living in mountain villages or remote hamlets. Even persons who are perhaps not true recluses may dislike being involved with the world. They make proud faces as they lock up their homes and have no intercourse with earthly affairs. Their intention does not necessarily lie in withdrawing themselves over dissatisfaction with the actions of the government. Their minds and wills are timid and weak. They do not have the courage to get involved with things. They are narrow-minded and cannot tolerate others. Because they do not tolerate others, others do not tolerate them either. Both sides thus step further and further backwards. Their differences become glaring, and finally they become enemies and end up resenting each other. This must be said to be a great evil for society.

Again, in reference to human relations, there are people who look at another's deeds without interest in the person himself, or listen to the report of his words from a distance. When the other does not accord with their own wills, they never are sympathetic or loving; on the contrary, they nurture thoughts of dislike and disapproval. Many, in fact, go to the extreme of hate. This also is the result of human nature and habit. If people would discuss things personally more often, matters which cannot be solved through intermediaries or letters may be completely cleared up. People usually say: 'Actually, this is the case. But if I have to face that person, I cannot tell him exactly what I think.' In other words, there are sincere feelings of human nature which incline a person toward being tolerant. Once there is tolerance on both sides, they will understand one another, and resentment will vanish away. For example, the

many assassinations of past and present times might not have happened, if there had been the opportunity for the one assassinated and his murderer to have been together for several days to express their true minds. Even such enemies might have not only made peace, but perhaps even become rare friends.

From the above consideration we can see that the obstruction of free expression and human enterprise is not merely a sickness of the government. It is prevalent among the people of the whole country. Even scholars have not avoided its contamination. The vital energies of human life cannot develop unless they are in contact with things. Let men speak and work freely, and leave fortune and social station to the persons themselves to attain, without being impeded by others.

SECTION FOURTEEN

I A CRITICISM OF PEOPLE'S THOUGHTS

AS I observe people passing their lives, I find that they do more evil and foolish things than they think in their hearts, and do not achieve so much success as they had planned. But no matter how wicked people are, there is none who devotes his whole life to performing only evil deeds. Yet, meeting with opportunities in the course of daily life, a person may suddenly be tempted to do evil, even though he knows quite well that it is so. He may make selfish excuses of various sorts to console himself. Or when he does some evil to another, he may not at all think that it was wrong, and so feel no shame. He may even think that he has done something good, so that when another holds a different view on the matter, he becomes angry and resentful. But as the months and years pass by and he reflects further upon his past deed, he will be filled with shame, realizing that he was in fact at fault.

In human nature there are differences in intelligence and strength, but there are no people who think that they are inferior to the birds and beasts in intelligence. Sometimes a person chooses a task in society that he thinks is suited to his own capability, but as he gets into his work he unexpectedly makes many blunders. His original estimation had been a miscalculation. He will be laughed at by people and regret that he ever began to do it. We onlookers may regard his miscalculation as something truly ridiculous. But the person's plan was not necessarily stupid. Further inquiry may show that he was indeed justified in making the attempt he did. In the busy world of men, changes of fortune are not easily predictable. Because of this, even wise men do more foolish things than they intend.

A person's prospects are always general, and it is extremely difficult to calculate the difficulty and size of an undertaking with the length of time it will take. [Benjamin] Franklin once said that at first one may consider a thing to be satisfactory, but as he actually attends to it, he will inevitably find that it is not. How true this is. When we instruct a carpenter to do some work, or order a tailor to make some suit of

clothes, they will end up behind schedule eight or nine times out of ten. They do not necessarily do this out of rudeness. They simply did not make an accurate calculation regarding how long the work would take in the first place.

It is not uncommon for people to reproach carpenters or tailors for breaking their promises. They may have some reason for doing so, since carpenters and tailors are always offering excuses and the customers are always forced to be understanding. But have these gentlemen themselves ever finished promised work on schedule? After a student leaves his home in the country promising to endure every hardship to complete his course of studies in three years, does he fulfil his promise? Does the person who raised money with difficulty and bought original sources which he had longed for and promised himself to read through in three months' time ever really fulfil his promise? If an interested gentlemen made a repeated petition to come into government office, introduce sweeping reforms, etc., does he ever remain true to his word after coming into office? If a needy student says that if he had ten thousand *ryō* of gold he would build schools tomorrow throughout the country to provide education for all, would he be true to his word if by chance some millionaire family like Mitsui or Kōnoike adopted him? There are no end to fancies of this sort. They are all dreams caused by the fact that people do not compare the difficulty of a project with the duration of time it will take, and so are too generous and too superficial in their calculations.

Again, as I listen to those who undertake some business venture, I find that the majority say that they will accomplish it in ten years time or within their lifetime. A small number say in one or three years, and hardly any say within a month, or right away. But I have never seen anyone who has already completed a project begun ten years ago. Thus when people speak of something in the far-off future, they seem to be planning some great exploit, but when the scheduled date of completion gradually draws near, the person cannot clearly explain what the original project was. And this trouble is due, after all, to the fact that in the planning stage there was insufficient consideration of the time it would take to complete.

As I said above in reference to human affairs, men do more evil and more foolish things than they think. Therefore they do not accomplish as much as they plan to accomplish. There are some ways to prevent this problem, but here is one which people seldom take notice of: occasionally to weigh in one's mind the success and failure, the gains and losses of an

undertaking. In business terms, it is like the stock taking or the settlement of accounts.

No one plans a business venture which will fail from the start. A man first thinks of his ability and capital, and perceives business conditions before beginning the undertaking. The business then sometimes succeeds and sometimes fails, depending on changing business conditions. He may fail to stock some articles, or succeed in some sale. When he settles up accounts at the end of a month or a year, sometimes things have gone as hoped, and sometimes not. Or when pressed with business he thinks that a certain article will sell well, but it sometimes turns out to be a loss on the balance sheet, contrary to his expectations. Sometimes he thinks he is understocking himself, only to find that the reverse was true. Therefore it is most important in business to try to be timely in calculating sales potential, and to make a precise balance of accounts every day.

The same principle applies to other human affairs. Since the active business of human life begins from about one's tenth year when a person attains to the use of reason, people should endeavor daily to make a precise balance of accounts and not to suffer losses in the attainment of knowledge and virtue. When a person examines his account books, he will always find some troublesome areas in regard to past or present actions. He should inquire: What have been the losses and gains in the past ten years? What business are you now engaged in, and how is it going? What articles are you now buying in, and when and where are they to be sold? Have you carefully supervised your store, or have you suffered losses because of the dissipation and laziness of your servants? Do you have sure prospects for the coming year? Are there other ways to increase your knowledge and virtue? Let me give one or two examples of these below.

The samurai who used to say that poverty was the usual lot of the samurai and the most important things were loyalty and patriotism, while they indiscriminately ate up the peasants' rice with haughty mien —but who today are in reality hard up—were like people who stocked swords, not knowing that there were foreign-made rifles. They made temporary profits, and then took great losses. Similarly, those who strongly believe in ancient things, who study only the old books of China and Japan to the exclusion of the ever-advancing Western learning, are like persons who stock mosquito nets with the coming of winter, still mindful of the good business they enjoyed in the summer past. And young students who suddenly enter government service before their learning has matured, and therefore wander through the lowest-grade posts all

their careers, are like those who pawn their half-made clothes and forfeit them. A person ignorant of the first steps in geography and history, who finds it difficult even to write everyday letters, but tries to plunge into works of high sophistication only to turn to another book after reading the first few pages, is like one who begins a business without capital and changes that business every day.

To continue this metaphor, a person who reads Japanese, Chinese, and Western books but does not know the world and national situation and can hardly manage himself and his family is like one who runs a general store without an abacus. One who knows how to rule the country but not how to cultivate himself is like one who advises his neighbors how to balance their accounts while his own house is being robbed. One who likes to talk about the fashionable modern world but has no thoughts of his own in his head, even about himself, is like a person who knows the names but not the prices of goods. These faults are not uncommon in present-day Japan. They are caused by people drifting through life, never paying attention to their own situations and never examining their deeds from birth up to the present, or what they are doing now or should be in the future. Therefore I say that the final settlement of the account books is what clarifies business conditions and decides future prospects. In like manner, careful attention to the balance of knowledge and virtue is what will clarify a person's present and future course.

II THE MEANING OF THE WORD *sewa*

THE term *sewa*[1] has two meanings: (i) 'protection' and (ii) 'counsel'. The former means to stand by the side and watch over a person, or give him money or things, or spend time with him so that he will not lose profits or honor. The latter is something done for the good of a person. It means to give instructions concerning what is good for another, and to protest against what is bad for another. It means to give advice to some one to the best of one's ability.

'Care' of others will be really meaningful and conducive to social order if it is done with both of the above meanings in mind. For example, if parents will take care of their children by providing for their everyday needs, children will obey their counsels and their home life will be tranquil. If the government makes good laws and takes good care of the people's lives, honor, and private property, and 'protects' them by

[1] 世話, 'care'.

maintaining public order, the people will obey the government. Thus if nothing goes against this 'counsel', the government and the people will be in harmony.

Therefore, 'protection' and 'counsel' have an area common to both in which they coincide. But when they go at cross purposes with each another, immediately there is trouble that results in misfortune. There are not a few examples of this in society; they occur because people misinterpret the meaning of the word *sewa*. They sometimes interpret it to mean 'protection' and sometimes to mean 'counsel', but always one-sidedly, and this can lead to serious mistakes.

For example, if parents do not refrain from giving their dissolute son more money, they may be giving him protective care but not giving him counseling care. And even if a child studies hard and obeys his parents' orders, for them to have him enter the harsh, illiterate world without giving him enough food and clothing, means the parents have conversely only counseled him but been lax in protecting him. The former is an example of lack of filial piety, the latter of lack of compassion. Both are to be called immoral.

There is an old saying about wearing out a welcome mat by calling on another too often. This means that excessive concern to advise someone who does not want it, or imprudent protesting to that person without knowing his temperament, will on the contrary result in that person hating, or resenting, or ridiculing us. As there is no benefit in this, the saying tells us to be careful not to bother him. This also means that where counsel does not apply, neither does protection.

Again, an elderly country gent in favor of the 'good old days' may take out the genealogy of his main-family line and proceed to stir up trouble for a branch family. Or an uncle without money may summon his niece and give instruction to her about managing her own household, or may reproach her heartlessness and carelessness. Or even worse, he may try to take away her family's property, saying that it was in her grandfather's secret will. This would be a case of excessive counsel, without the slightest regard for protection. It is what a proverb calls unsolicited meddling.

Take also the instance of what is called relief for the poor, which looks only to the outward appearance of poverty and gives rice and money to the poor, regardless of whether they are good or not, and without inquiring about the causes of their poverty. It is reasonable to relieve those who are alone in the world without anyone to rely upon. But there are others who convert over half of their relief rice into sake.

If they are indiscriminately given rice without anyone being able to counsel them to give up sake, it means that the protection far exceeds the counsel. Another proverb calls this 'excessive sympathy'. It is said that England has the same trouble with her own relief laws.

Broadening this principle and applying it to the national level, we find that people pay taxes and supply the needs of the government, thus supporting the household aspects of the government. But a despotic government disregards the suggestions of the people and blocks avenues of expression. Here protection has been accepted, but counsel has been blocked. From the point of view of the people, we can say that the government is also giving unsolicited protection.

It would be impossible to enumerate all the examples of this. Since the meaning of the word *sewa* is a most important part of economic theory, people of every walk of life should pay attention to it in their daily lives. The principle may seem to be entirely calculating and cold. But if one tries to be sympathetic when he ought to be dispassionate, or ignores the facts to make them seem more emotional than they are, and thereby ignores sincere feelings and makes human association unpleasant, it would be to give precedence to names over substance.

I have stated my main position above, but since I fear people's misunderstanding I will add a few more words here by way of further clarification. Some moral teachings seem to go contrary to economic laws. But in fact there is no connection between personal moral cultivation and the national economy. Sometimes a person will give money to a beggar who is a total stranger, without asking any questions. This may be a form of protection, but it is not given together with counsel.

If we discuss this problem [giving money to a beggar without counseling] by narrowing it down to the sphere of public economics, this act may seem to be improper, but the idea of giving a charitable donation should be most highly esteemed as a personal virtue. For example, it is reasonable to have a law prohibiting beggars, but we should not reproach individuals who show charity to beggars. Everything cannot be decided by dispassionate calculation. It is essential to distinguish the proper spheres in which dispassionate calculation is appropriate. Scholars who are intoxicated with rational economic arguments should not forget that there is also room for the personal virtues of love and kindness.

SECTION FIFTEEN

METHODIC DOUBT AND SELECTIVE JUDGEMENT

THERE is much that is false in the world of belief, and much that is true in the world of doubt. We need only consider how stupid people believe in other people's words, books, novels, rumors, the gods and Buddha, and fortunetellers. On the advice of a masseur they use grasses and herbs to cure a parent's mortal illness. At the time of the marriage negotiations over their daughter, they believe a fortune teller's analysis of the 'physiognomy' of a suitor's house, and thus lose a good husband. Their faith in Amida prompts them to intone the *nembutsu* instead of calling a doctor when they have a high fever. Because of their faith in *Fudō Myō-ō* they die after a twenty-one-day fasting. In these cases, the quantity of truth is small indeed. But where truth is sparse, falsity cannot help being proportionately great. For even though these people believe in facts, they are believing in false facts. Hence I say that there is much that is false in the world of belief.

The progress of civilization lies in seeking the truth both in the area of physical facts and in the spiritual affairs of man. The reason for the West's present high level of civilization is that in every instance they proceeded from some point of doubt. Galileo [1564–1642] discovered that the earth is a planet by doubting the old theories of astronomy. Galvani [1737–98] discovered electricity in animals when he doubted that frogs' legs are the cause of convulsions. Newton [1642–1727] discovered the principle of gravity when he saw an apple falling from a tree. Watt [1736–1819] entertained doubts concerning the properties of steam when he was experimenting with a boiling kettle. In all these cases, they attained to the truth by following the road of doubt. Let me now turn to human progress, leaving behind the investigations for natural laws. It was Thomas Clarkson [1760–1846] who put an end to a source of great social misery for later generations by calling into question the justice of the law of buying slaves. It was Martin Luther [1483–1546] who reformed the Christian faith through doubting the false teachings of the Roman religion. The French began the French Revolution by calling into question the authority of the *ancien régime*. The American

colonists achieved their independence by calling into question the laws set up over them by England.

Even today the reason that the great persons of the West lead people along the path to higher civilization is that their purpose is entirely to refute the once firm and irrefutable theories of the ancients, and to entertain doubts concerning practices about which common sense had never doubted before. For example, although it seems to be an almost natural human division of labor that the man should work outside the house and the woman keep order within it, [J.] Stuart Mill [1806–73] wrote a book on women which attempted to destroy this custom which had been fixed and immovable since time immemorial. Many English economists advocate the doctrine of laissez faire, and its adherents believe it to be a universal law of economics. But American scholars advocate protective tariff laws. In fact, each country proposes its own economic theory. For every theory gives rise to a counter-theory, and disputes between rival theories never cease. In contrast to this ferment of ideas, the peoples of Asia have uncritically believed in foolish teachings, have been bewitched by the gods and Buddhas, or have listened to the sayings of the so-called sages. They have not come under their influence only temporarily; they have been unable to escape from these ideas after thousands of generations. The quality of their deeds, the depths of their courage of mind and will are incomparably less than the peoples of the West. Pursuit of the truth when there is a conflict of different opinions is like sailing a boat against the wind. The boat's course must tack to the right and to the left. The high waves and strong winds may force it to sail through several hundred *ri* of water, but its straight-line course would come to no more than three to five *ri*. It is also possible to sail with a following breeze, but this is never so in human affairs. The course to the truth lies only through a zigzag course through the disputations of rival theories. These theories all arise from doubt. Hence I have said that there is much truth in the world of doubt.

Yet if it is true that we should not lightly believe things, we should also not uncritically doubt things. One must have insight into when to believe and when to remain skeptical. The essence of learning may lie in clarifying this kind of discernment. Even in Japan, the sudden change in men's minds since the opening of our ports, the reforms in government, the overthrow of the nobility, the development of the school system, opening of newspapers, the new railroads, telegraph, military conscription, industries, etc.—the reform of a hundred practices in a very short period of time—can all be said to have been the accom-

plishment of those who endeavored to effect these changes after calling into doubt customs which had been observed since time immemorial. But still, ancient customs were called into question only after Japan was opened to intercourse with the West. The reformers saw the superiority of Western civilization, and tried to imitate it. Therefore they were not motivated by self-originated doubt. They only believe in the new through the same faith with which they once believed in the old. The focus of past beliefs has only been redirected toward the modern West, but we have no guarantee that a truly critical choice has been made concerning present beliefs and doubts. I regret, of course, that due to my as yet shallow learning and limited experience I cannot enumerate in each and every case the rightness or wrongness of what is being accepted and discarded. But surveying the general trend of the changes in human life, it can be clearly shown that human sentiment tends to ride along with the times. Conservatives and liberals each go to extremes; neither side knows how far to go in believing or questioning the old or the new. Let me discuss the point further below.

East and West have had different customs, and especially different sentiments, for thousands of years. Even when their relative merits and demerits are clear, ancient customs cannot suddenly be interchanged from one country to another. This is all the more true in things which are not yet clearly known for what they are. Our judgement for the acceptance or rejection of these customs can only be made after their nature has been clarified through countless considerations over the years. But nowadays the somewhat better educated reform-minded people, or those who are called 'teachers of enlightenment', are constantly proclaiming the excellence of Western civilization. When one of them holds forth, ten thousand others nod their heads in approval. From teachings about knowledge and morality down to government, economics, and the minute details of daily life, there are none who do not propose emulation of the ways of the West. Even those as yet less informed about the West seem to be entirely abandoning the old in favor of the new. How superficial they are in uncritically believing things Western and doubting things Eastern!

Now, the superiority of Western over Japanese civilization is certainly very great, but Western civilization is hardly perfect. I could never begin to enumerate all its defects. Its ways and customs are not all beautiful and believable; our customs are not all ugly and open to question. Let us take the example of a young man who becomes a great admirer of a teacher. Wanting to emulate his teacher's manners, he

quickly reforms his own mind, buys books and writing materials, and works hard day and night at his desk. This is, of course, commendable. But if he excessively imitates his teacher's ways, even the latter's bad habit of talking late into the night and rising late in the morning, thus ruining his own health in the bargain, shall we still call him intelligent? For this youth regards his teacher as the complete scholar. Therefore regardless of his good and bad points, he imitates them all, and thereby brings himself to grief. There is an ancient Chinese proverb about imitating the eyebrows of Sei-shi.[1] The knitted brows of Sei-shi were attractive in themselves; therefore, it may still not be blameworthy to imitate her. But what good can there be in the late rising of the old scholar? Late rising is what it is, the vice of laziness and the neglect of health. To imitate another even to the point of his vices is surely the height of folly. Yet not a few of the proponents of enlightenment nowadays are like this young scholar. Let me try to imagine the arguments of these teachers of enlightenment together with the different customs and practices of East and West.

Let us imagine that Westerners bathed every day, while the Japanese barely once or twice a month; the teachers of enlightenment would exclaim that the people who are civilized and enlightened are always clean, stimulate their skin, maintain the laws of hygiene, etc., but the uncivilized Japanese do not understand these principles! If the Japanese kept a small chamber pot in their bedrooms at night, or did not wash after going to the bathroom, while the Westerners rose even in the middle of the night to go to the toilet and each time washed their hands, the proponents of enlightenment would declare that the enlightened Westerners place a high value on cleanliness, while the unenlightened Japanese do not know the meaning of the word, that they are like infants who are still too immature to distinguish cleanliness from filth. They will declare that the Japanese will imitate the beautiful customs of the West once they advance to the level of modern Western civilization. Or suppose that it was the Westerners who had the practice of using disposable paper handkerchiefs, while the Japanese used cloth ones which they used again after washing them. The proponents of enlightenment would exercise their wits and contrive clever sophistries about the great principles of economics, saying that in a country whose capital is low, the people naturally and unconsciously follow the principle of

[1] A beautiful lady, Sei-shi 西施 of Yüeh, being sick, knitted her eyebrows. Since she still looked so beautiful, ugly women thought that if they did likewise they would become beautiful too.

frugality. They would say that if the Japanese imitated the Western practice of using paper handkerchiefs to blow their noses, it would be wasting the country's resources. Therefore they endure this uncleanliness of using cloth handkerchiefs to be frugal, since they are pressed for lack of capital. Or if Japanese women hung gold rings from their ears, wore girdles, and had jewelry on their dresses, the proponents of enlightenment would cite a bit of biological theory and raise serious objections about the terrible unenlightenment of the Japanese. They would say that not only do Japanese women not distinguish principles and follow nature, they are even damaging their health by hanging luggage from their ears. They would say that Japanese women are torturing their waists, which is the most important part of a woman's body, by making it like the waist of a wasp. They would further say that this prevents the chance of pregnancy and increases the dangers of childbirth, the calamity of which brings sorrow to a family on a small scale, and damages the sources of population of the nation on a large scale. And although Westerners barely use locks within and without the house, and although when they go on trips they hire porters to carry their luggage, which, while never locked, is never robbed, or although they order carpenters and plasterers to repair their homes without need of detailed contracts, but rarely go to court concerning breach of contract on a later day—if the Japanese on the other hand locked every room within the house, and put locks even on small chests by their side, and if they disputed and recorded every word on a contract, and yet things were still robbed and there were many cases of broken contracts brought to trial—the proponents of enlightenment would again sigh, saying how wonderful the holy teaching of Jesus Christ, and how pitiable the pagans outside of the Christian faith! It would look as if we Japanese lived in a den of thieves! Certainly, Japan cannot hold a candle in comparison with the customs of freedom and honesty in the West! Indeed, the countries in which the Holy Bible is preached would be exactly like the proverb says: so honest that people do not even pick things up off the roads. If the Japanese rolled and smoked cigarettes, while the Westerners used long pipes, they would declare that the Japanese lacked skill in making instruments and that was why they had not yet invented such pipes. If the Japanese wore shoes and Westerners wore *geta*, they would say that the Japanese did not know how to use the toes in wearing *geta*. If *miso* soup was brought on foreign vessels, it would not be thought of so lightly, as it is now. If *tōfu* [bean curd] was also found on the tables of the Westerners, its reputation would increase tenfold. Such dishes as baked

eel or *chawanmushi* [thick custard-like soup made with egg] would be praised as among the world's superlative dishes. There would be no end if I enumerated these things. But let me go on to the more elegant matter of religious teachings.

If four hundred years ago a Saint Shinran was born in the West and a Martin Luther in Japan, and if Shinran had reformed the Buddhism practiced in the West and spread the True Pure Land teaching, while Luther had opposed the Roman religion of Japan and founded Protestantism, the proponents of enlightenment would certainly make the following evaluation. They would say that the great purpose of religion lies, not in killing, but in the salvation of all sentient beings. If this purpose is misconceived to any degree, the rest of its teachings are not worthy of consideration. In the West, Shinran embodied this principle. He slept in the fields with a stone as pillow. At great cost and suffering he devoted the labors of his lifetime to reform his country's religion, so that today it is the religious faith of the majority of the people of the nation. So wide did his evangelism reach. And after Shinran's death, the fact that his disciples neither murdered men of other faiths nor were murdered for religious reasons can be said to have been entirely because of the merit of his teaching. But reflect, they would say, on how Luther came forward to challenge the old teachings of Rome. The Catholics did not easily succumb to his attack. The old and new teachings fought each other like a tiger and wolf, tooth and nail. After Luther's death, there occurred so many killings of Japanese citizens and so much waste of the nation's resources because of religion, because of starting wars to destroy other nations, that they can neither be recorded with the pen nor spoken in words. The barbarous Japanese given to such slaughter visited such great sufferings on the souls of men because of the teachings of 'universal salvation', and of 'love thy enemy'. As for the fruits of their accomplishments, Luther's Protestantism may be said not to have been able yet to convert half of the people of Japan. Such are the differences of the religions of East and West, as told by the proponents of enlightenment!

I myself have entertained doubts about these things for a long time. But I still am not sure I have grasped the real causes of the great differences between the religions of East and West. When I ponder the matter privately, the following kind of questions come to my mind. Although Christianity preached in Japan and Buddhism in the West are similar in nature, is it that when practiced in a barbarous land they promote the spirit of killing, but create a spirit of tolerance in an enlightened country? Or do they differ in essence from the start? Or did Luther, the founder

of the Japanese Reformation, and Shinran of the West differ greatly in the attainments of their virtue? The proponents of the enlightenment would say that these questions are not to be recklessly and superficially decided, but await the judgement of the scholars of future generations.

In terms of the above, our present-day reformers, who dislike the old customs of Japan and believe in the things of the West, cannot be said to have entirely escaped the criticism of having their own superficial beliefs and doubts. They believe in the new with the same blind faith with which they once believed in the old. In their excessive admiration of Western civilization, they emulate the vices of the West as well, like the women who imitated the knitted eyebrows of Sei-shi, or the student who imitated his master's late rising. Even worse, they reject the old even before they have been able to discover the new to believe in. Their bodies are empty, as it were, having lost the position of spiritual peace and firm resolve. There have even been cases of insanity because of this. What a pity! (According to doctors' reports, incidents of nervous illness or insanity are on the rise in recent times.)

The civilization of the West is of course to be admired. It has been only recently since we have begun to do so. But it would be better not to believe at all than to do so superficially. The West's wealth and power must truly be envied, but we must not go so far as to imitate the unequal distribution of wealth among her peoples as well. The taxes of Japan are not light, but if we consider the suffering of the poor people of England because of oppression by the landlord class, we should rather celebrate the happy condition of Japan's farmers. The custom of honoring women in the West is among the finest in the world. But if a wicked wife dominates and plagues her husband, or a disobedient daughter scorns her parents and gives free rein to disgraceful conduct, let us not be intoxicated over the custom.

Therefore, we can ask: Are the things being practiced in present-day Japan achieving their purposes as they are? Are Japanese business methods good as they now stand? Are the forms of government effective as they are now administered? Is the present system of education good as it is? Is the form of books published now good as it is? Furthermore, are my present methods of research good as they are, following the modern way? As I ponder these questions, a hundred doubts well up in me. It is as if I were now groping for something in the dark. Living in the very midst of these complex and intertwining problems, is it not difficult to compare things Eastern and Western, to believe and to doubt what should be and accept and reject what should be, with proper discernment? The re-

sponsibility of doing so falls today on no others than scholars such as ourselves. We must make every effort. To consider these problems there is nothing better than to study them. If we read many books, touch upon many of these questions, and take a keen interest in them without anxiety or prejudice, in order to find the truth, we shall suddenly be able to distinguish the areas of belief and doubt with clarity. Yesterday's beliefs may become tomorrow's doubts, and today's doubts may melt away in tomorrow's sun. Let us, therefore, make every effort as scholars.

SECTION SIXTEEN

THE SPIRIT OF INDEPENDENCE IN EVERYDAY AFFAIRS

PEOPLE talk these days about 'freedom and independence', but we should not be mistaken about what this really means. There are two forms of independence, material and spiritual. Simply stated, one refers to things and the other to the mind.

The former means that each person in society may possess his own property and conduct his own affairs, and thereby provide for himself and his family without being a burden to others. In a word, it means to be responsible for oneself. Such material independence is something tangible, but spiritual independence of mind has a profounder meaning and wider implications. It sometimes involves matters which appear to be unrelated to it, and so people are apt to misunderstand its meaning. Let me give an example, even though it is a trivial one.

A proverb says: 'A man drinks the first cup of sake, but the third cup drinks the man.' This means that desire for sake can end up controlling a man's mind, thus taking away his freedom of choice. Nowadays, not only sake but any number of things hinder the independent judgement of man's mind. A man's *haori* coat does not match his clothes, and so he feels compelled to have another *haori* coat made. Or someone's tobacco pouch does not match his clothes, so he buys another one. Or if his clothes are well provided, his small house cramps his style of living. But when his new house is just finished, he feels constrained to celebrate with an extravagant dinner party. The dishes of rice and eel will further lead him to more extravagant Western dishes. Next he must buy a gold watch, and from this he progresses on to the next form of conspicuous consumption, and on and on endlessly. Considering these compulsions, we may conclude that the master is not his own master. The man has become the slave of his own desires.

I can give worse examples than those. In the former instance the persons were only slaves within the sphere of their own households. But consider the case of a person controlled by other people's possessions. Such is the person who is always aping someone else's tastes. He must have a new suit of Western clothes made because his neighbor has one.

He must build a three-story house because his neighbor has built a two-story one. His friends' possessions become models for his purchases, or his friends' conversations will turn into a plan for his own order sheet. Or even though he knows full well that it is somewhat unbecoming for him, a tall and dark person, to wear a gold ring on his strong-jointed finger, he still feels compelled to raise the money for one, thinking it is the Western custom. Or knowing quite well that it is best to wear a *yukata* and fan himself after a bath in the hot summer, he suffers under tight-sleeved Western shirts and suits, and sits there in his own sweat. His sole concern is to ape someone else's tastes. As for his aping other person's likings, let's pass that over. But the most laughable kind of person is the one who misconceives what others actually have. Take, for example, the housewife who turns green with envy over the fact that her neighbor has bought a silk crepe and an ornamental hairpin of pure gold. She too has to order the same things. But later on she finds out that her neighbor's dress was made of cotton crepe and the hairpin was only gold plated.

In all these cases, the compulsion came not so much from one's own possessions or those of others, but from one's own anxieties and delusions, which take complete control of the person's household. This frame of mind is far indeed from true independence of mind. Each person should take the measure of himself.

A person's annual income of a thousand yen or his monthly salary of a hundred yen will all go down the drain as he exerts himself to live in this kind of dream world. As he ruins his family fortune and annual or monthly income, the person then becomes despondent, and all he will have to show for it are useless household furnishings and a habit of luxury. What a pity! He may expend his energies to build up wealth as the basis of personal independence, but only to lose that independence altogether as he falls victim to his own fortune. This is precisely to lose independence by the same means used to seek independence. I am not praising the attitude of a skinflint, but I do hope that people would use their money in such a way that they, and not their money, are the masters.

THE COMPATIBILITY OF INTENTION AND ACTIVITY

PEOPLE usually say that arguments should become deeds, but few ever get beyond the stage of just talk. Now, an argument is in one sense a written or verbal expression of one's views. When as yet unuttered or written down, it is called a person's motive or intention. It may thus be

said that an argument has nothing to do with things outside of oneself. In short, it is something within, something free and undetermined. Deeds mean the expression of one's views outwardly. Therefore actual deeds are always determined by external conditions, and cannot be perfectly free. In the past, people distinguished the ideas of 'word and deeds', or 'intentions and conduct'. What is popularly called 'views and actions' refers to the same things.

An 'inconsistency between words and deeds' means that what one argues for and what one actually does are not the same. 'To give stipends for work actually done and not for good intentions' means that you get payed for what you actually perform. Mere intentions are insubstantial, and not worthy of particular praise. Thus people sometimes say that another person may have various ideas, but he is essentially a good-for-nothing. This is another way of saying that there is a discrepancy between one's claims and his actual deeds.

Therefore claims and deeds must properly balance and coincide. For the convenience of my young readers I shall use the words *intentions* and *work*, and try to discuss the point that when they do balance mankind can be benefited, and when they do not the opposite will be true.

First, there are different kinds of human works, of relative importance and magnitude. A dramatic play, scholarship, pulling a rickshaw, piloting a steamboat, farming with a hoe, writing books—these are all equally works of man. But some men prefer not to become actors, and become scholars instead; or learn navigation instead of becoming rickshaw pullers; or prefer writing books to farming. Such people have passed over the relatively simpler tasks for more sophisticated jobs. What is it that has made them so discriminating? It is their own minds, their own intentions, which are more sophisticated and elevated. Therefore I am saying that men's minds must have high ideals, and if not, their work will also remain common.

Secondly, some of man's works are of great use and others of little use, regardless of their relative difficulty. The arts of *go* and *shōgi* are no less difficult than studying astronomy, geography, mechanics, and mathematics. But they are far less useful. Those who can discern the relative usefulness of things and take the useful side are people of true insight. If one has no insight, he will exert himself to no purpose.

Thirdly, there must be principles in a person's activities. There is a right time and place for everything. For example, a sermon on morals is desirable, but if one starts to preach suddenly in the midst of merry-making, he will only be laughed at. The stormy discussions of students

are sometimes not uninteresting, but if they take place in a family gathering of women and children, it will be sheer insanity. A person who can discern the right time and place for them has clear insight. A person who acts without insight is like steam without an engine, or a boat without a rudder. Not only will he accomplish nothing, he will often do positive harm.

Fourthly, the above are examples of vices in which men have practical abilities but are careless in thought. There is also the contrary case where their thoughts are lofty, but they have no practical ability. This too is quite out of balance. A person whose lofty ideas run out ahead of his actual abilities will be frustrated. He does not like to do work which he is capable of because they do not measure up to his ideals. But he is too deficient in practical ability to give his mind full play, and so he does not do anything at all. Thereupon, instead of blaming himself, he reproaches others, or says his proper opportunity never came. It seems as if he is possessed by the idea that there was no work for him to do anywhere. Consequently he withdraws to brood by himself. He complains that others are his enemies and unkind to him. His attitude is like that of one who reproaches someone else for not promptly returning money that was in fact never lent.

All the livelong day there seems to be only grief and unhappiness. The Confucian scholars grieve that no one understands them. Students deplore the fact that there is no one to give them correct guidance. Government officials complain that they cannot find the secret to rising up the ladder of success. Merchants grumble over bad business conditions. After the abolition of the *han*, the ex-samurai deplored the fact that they could not make a living; nobles out of office complain of lack of respect. Everyone is complaining these days. Just watch people's sour faces. How few there are whose speech and looks are cheerful and full of life! In my own experience, I am always meeting gloomy ones, and never cheerful ones. Many could lend their faces to condolence cards. What a pity! If each person could just be made to work according to his ability, be would naturally cheer up with exuberance over his work as he gradually grew to harmonize his aspirations and actual deeds. But people never think of this. Their aspirations run way ahead of their deeds, and so they are endlessly frustrated. They are like a stone image of Jizō infused with the soul of a postal courier, or like a paralyzed patient whose nerves have become extremely sensitive. From this we may judge how great people's grievances and frustrations are.

Again, a person with noble intentions but poor practical ability is

sometimes disliked and isolated by others. His work is, of course, inferior to others. But from his own point of view he finds faults only in others. Consequently people dislike him. When people are discontented and despise each other, they will finally ridicule each other as being eccentric and queer, and will not associate with each other. In my view, some people are disliked by others because of their own arrogance and insolence, or because they desire to get the better of others, or are too demanding, or slander others. They fail always to make a true comparison of themselves with others. They make their own noble intentions the criteria with which to judge others. They then create enchanting fancies about themselves which only arouse the hatred of others. Finally they withdraw from others' company and fall into despondency and loneliness.

Let me therefore say to the younger generation: if you are dissatisfied with another person's efforts, try to do it yourself. If you think another's business is poorly done, just try to do better. Put your own household in order if you think your neighbor's household is not. Write a book yourself before commenting on another's. Before you comment on a scholar or a doctor, become one yourself. If you want to meddle in another's work, no matter how trivial, put yourself in the other's shoes and then examine yourself. Or if someone else's job is completely different from yours, make a fair estimation of the relative difficulty and importance of his work. If his work is different, you will not make a mistake if you compare just the practical ability of yourself and the other person.

SECTION SEVENTEEN

ON POPULARITY

A PERSON whom many others look up to and point to may be called popular. If they credit him in advance with having the kind of personality which will certainly not fail in whatever calling he pursues and in whatever job is entrusted to him, then such a person is one for whom society has great expectations, and will achieve popularity. Popularity is a relative thing. But if a person cannot be accredited in the slightest degree by others, he will be of no use at all. To take a small example, a person who is sent on an errand to buy something worth ten sen is trusted to that amount, and is accredited by others to that amount. Passing from ten sen to one yen, from one yen to a thousand, ten thousand, and finally to a person who manages a bank which has a reserve of several million yen, or again to a governor of a prefecture or province, not only do they have charge over money, but also over the welfare, wealth, and honor of their fellow citizens. Therefore unless persons in such trust have the popularity of their fellow citizens and are trusted by them, it will be rather difficult for them to do their proper jobs. Not to trust them in such instances would be to call their integrity or ability into question. There will be no limit to distrusting them.

There are many examples, both past and present, of strange anecdotes told about how the worries of men were aggravated by placing *metsuke* [feudal censors] to spy on other *metsuke*, by ordering inspectors to inspect other inspectors, etc., but without ultimate success. There are also many people who buy without examining the products of Mitsui or Daimaru, thinking that there is no overcharge, for the price must be fixed on price tags. And there are many who think that the works of Bakin must certainly be interesting, and so they order them just on account of the titles. Therefore the stores of Mitsui and Daimaru and the works of Bakin become increasingly popular. In this way popularity is a great convenience to business and the writing of books. From this we can know the importance of popularity.

The question of popularity or name is beside the point when talking

about putting a 16-*kan* weight on the back of a person who has the power to lift it, or about lending one thousand yen to a person who has an estate worth that amount. For these are entirely questions of whether the person can handle the added weight or debt in actual fact. But the affairs of men are generally not as plain and simple as that. Even a person who cannot lift ten *kan* can sit down and move several hundred *kan,* or a person who is not worth a thousand yen can put several tens of thousands of yen in circulation. If we plunged suddenly into the accounting rooms of merchants who have the reputation of being financial barons, and made a precise calculation of their books, there would be some that were short several hundred or several thousand yen in their accounts. Even though such a shortage amounts to more than the property owned, and so these men are several hundred or thousand times worse off than a penniless beggar, society nonetheless does not compare them to beggars. Why is this? This is because the merchant has credit. Accordingly, reputation does not essentially lie in having great prestige or properties. It is something gradually accumulated through an alert and clever mind, and the virtue of an honest character.

This is rational, but still there have been not a few cases of its opposite in public affairs in both ancient and modern times. Phoney doctors have enlarged their office entrances and become prosperous. Quacks have put up gold signboards and widened their sales of medicines. Speculators have empty safes on their desks. Scholars adorn their study rooms with original sources which they cannot even read. People riding home in rickshaws read the newspapers, only to feel drowsy and have to take a nap after this ostentatious effort of intelligence. The same people who weep tears in church on Sunday afternoon fight with their spouses on Monday morning. Throughout the nation, honest and false, good and bad are intermingled. Which can be called which? Even worse, there are not a few cases where the existence of popularity augurs the ignorance and wickedness of people. It is no wonder that somewhat high-minded gentlemen do not seek fame or deliberately avoid it as being the vainglory of the fleeting world. This is one of the commendable points in the attitude of a Confucian gentleman.

Nevertheless, if we discuss only the extreme cases in the affairs of society, there is nothing without harm. For the fact that the gentleman does not seek fame in the world seems to be praiseworthy, but he must first clarify the nature of fame before he decides to seek or not seek it. If such fame is the extreme of vainglory, like the doctor's entrance or the quack's signboard, it should of course be repudiated. But from an-

other point of view, human affairs are not all motivated by vanity. The wisdom and virtues of men are like flowering trees. Fame and popularity are their blossoms. When cultivating flowering trees, there is no reason for purposely preventing their blooming. Not carefully understanding the nature of fame and trying to cast it away is like clearing off the blossoms in order to conceal the trees' presence. There would be no particular merit in doing so. It would be no different from treating living things as dead. It is very harmful to the public good.

Yet, should we seek fame and reputation? I say, yes, we should. But we should do so according to our station and abilities. Winning popularity through mental and physical activities should be like measuring rice to give to others. Those who are skilled at measuring out one *to* of rice with a *masu* may sometimes under-measure so that there will be as much as three *gō* left over;[1] and those who are not skilful may over-measure it so that there will be a shortage of about the same amount. When I say win popularity according to one's station and abilities, I mean to measure the one *to* of rice exactly as one *to*, neither more nor less. There is relative skill in measuring rice, but the difference caused by it is only two or three per cent. But in the case of giving the measure of one's own talent and virtue, the tendency is to overestimate or underestimate oneself by far more than three per cent. The skilful person will inflate himself two or three times over, and the unskilful person will underestimate himself by as much as half his real worth. The excessive degree of the former will be a source of great harm to others, and of course is to be despised. But let me pass over that for a while, and here say a few words concerning the person who underestimates himself.

Confucius teaches that the gentleman does not grieve over not being known by others, but grieves that he does not know others. This teaching was meant to correct abuses which were current in his own time. But spiritless scholars of later times have taken these words at face value. Concentrating on the idea of withdrawal from the world, their harm has gradually increased, and finally they have become eccentric, speechless, and emotionless men, like pieces of wood which neither laugh nor cry. It is a curious fact that people look up to these men, and that they are even called elegant teachers. It is necessary to divest ourselves of these base customs and enter into the realm of energetic life. That is, we must have broad experience in the world of things and men, both to be known and to know men, and to give full play to our inherent abilities. In order

[1] 三合, i.e. 3% of one *to* 斗 of rice.

to be able to accomplish this for personal and social good, the following qualities are necessary.

1 One must study the art of speaking. To make one's ideas known through the written word is of course a powerful means, and naturally one should not neglect this path or give up his intention of writing books. But there is no more effective means than direct speaking to get one's thought across to others at first hand. Therefore one must strive to be as eloquent and vigorous as possible in speech. In recent times, speech meetings have been held, and it is of course beneficial to listen to useful matters at these meetings. Besides, both speakers and listeners can share in the benefit to be obtained from fluent and eloquent discourse. As I listen to poor speakers today, I find that their vocabulary is quite limited. They somehow seem to be at a loss for words and expressions.

Take, for example, the case of a school teacher giving a lecture on some translation. If the subject is that of round crystal jewels, the teacher makes no explanation of what the phrase means, taking it for granted that the students already know it. He only glares at them, saying that it means a round crystal jewel. But if this teacher had a rich vocabulary and mastery of expression, he could say that 'round' means something like a rice ball with corners rounded off, that 'crystal' is something like glass mined from the mountains, much of which is produced in Kōshū, and that this crystal has been formed into a jewel like a ball that rolls. If he explained it in these terms, even women and children could understand him. That he has a hard time using words that are useful is because he has not learned the art of public speech. Or take the case of some students who utter meaningless nonsense to the effect that they have to use English because Japanese is so inconvenient that they can neither write sentences nor make speeches properly. It seems to me that these students, though born in Japan, still have not made sufficient use of their own mother tongue. Every national language increases in proportion to the complexity of the country's affairs, and therefore people should not suffer any inconvenience. More than anything else, present-day Japanese must strive for fluency and eloquence in their own language.

2 It is necessary to have a cheerful demeanor, and not give a first impression which turns people off. To perk up one's shoulders and smile fawningly, to be a smooth talker, a drum-beater, or a flatterer, are of course detestable manners. But the following are just as detestable: to have a bitter-looking and sour face; to have the look of one praised for being taciturn but reproved for smiling; to have the look of one

suffering from chest pains all his life; to have a constant look of one in mourning for his dead parents. A cheerful and lively countenance is one mark of a man of true virtue; in social intercourse it is most essential. A person's countenance is like the door to his home. To have a wide circle of friends and callers who feel welcome, one must first open one's gate, scrub clean the entrance, and show pleasure in their arrival. But people nowadays go to the opposite extreme. They greet others with sour looks, in imitation of the pseudo-gentlemen, and are like people who put skeletons before their entrances and coffins before their gates. Who would want to call on them?

France is said to be the source of civilization and the center of knowledge in the world. The reason for this is, among other things, that the French people's activities are always lively and cheerful, and they have a spirit of warmth in their speech and appearance. It may be said that speech habits and appearance are inborn, and so it is useless to argue about them. This may seem true, but it turns out to be incorrect when we consider the principle of human intelligence and its development. Generally speaking, the power of human intellect will advance as much as it is made to advance. It is exactly like strengthening one's muscles through physical exercise. Therefore speech and appearance, which are also movements of the body and mind, cannot be improved through neglect. But has it not been a great mistake from ancient times that in Japan men have not cultivated these important functions? I am not saying that the Japanese must make a study of speech and appearance, but I hope that from the present on they will at least begin to take proper notice of this precept of human morality.

Some may say that to make one's appearance presentable means to adorn one's looks. And if the adornment of looks is made the essence of human association, people will not only adorn their looks and their clothes and foods, etc., they will even invite guests against their wishes and entertain them in a style inappropriate to their social standing. Thus, there will be vices in human association motivated by affectation.

Yes, such an idea may also seem to contain some truth, but affectation is an abuse of the true essence, as we can see in the saying: 'Too much is as bad as too little.' For example, the purpose of food is to nourish the body, but overeating will injure one's health. Nutrition is the meaning of taking food, overeating its abuse. The aim of human association is also to be harmonious and sincere. Addiction to ostentatious role-playing is not the true essence of human relationships.

No relations are as intimate as those between husband and wife, of

parents and child. Their essence consists in having a sincere heart that is harmonious and honest. Intimate relations can be realized only when affectation has been swept clear. Thus human friendship is based on sincerity, which is entirely different from ostentation. I say this to show people the direction in which they should strive, even though I do not expect people to treat others with the same affection as they treat their spouses or parents or children. These days people rightfully praise a person for being cheerful, open-hearted, free and easy, frank, manly, talkative but moderate in pressing his views, boisterous but lovable, taciturn but kind, or serious looking but frank, etc. These qualities are all family-like qualities, and put a premium on sincerity and harmony with others.

3 The saying goes: 'If people walk different paths, they never meet to discuss matters together.' People also misunderstand this saying. Birds of the same feather tend to flock together—scholars with scholars, doctors with doctors, etc. When they were schoolmates they were friends, but after graduation each goes his own way, as a merchant or a government official, etc., and drift miles apart, even becoming enemies in some cases. This is the worst vice of thoughtlessness. People should remember their old friends even while seeking new ones. They must meet with one another if they are going to communicate. We have all met someone by chance who has become a friend for life. In meeting with people, there is one chance in ten of making a real friend, and two chances in twenty. It is mainly in such a way that people get to know each other. Therefore, passing over the question of popularity and fame, it is a good thing to have many acquaintances and friends. You may meet someone on the Ginza who was in the same ferry boat with you years back, and the two of you may unexpectedly have something to offer each other. A greengrocer who delivers at your house may someday be there to take care of you when you fall ill at some inn along the highway to Ooshū. Men are neither devils nor serpents. They are not out to harm you. Let us receive people in a natural way, with true and open minds.

Therefore it is essential to have as broad a range of interests as possible if we want to widen our circle of friends as well. A person has to be able to play more than one note himself, and this means he should associate with people of all sorts of interests—intellectual interests, business interests, calligraphy and art, the games of *go* and *shōgi*. Except for dissipation, everything can become an avenue to friendship. People of no accomplishments whatever can still enjoy a meal or tea together. On an even lower level, people with strong builds may find in such games as

arm wrestling, pillow tug-of-war,[2] and leg-wrestling[3] the means to acquire friends. It may seem that arm wrestling and studying do not belong in the same categories. But the world is large and human associations multifarious. Men's lives should be different from that of a few crucian carp passing their days in the bottom of a well. Men should get to know and like one another.

[2] In this game, each of two opponents holds one end of a wooden pillow with the tips of his fingers and strives to pull it toward his side.

[3] Seated, two opponents strive to knock each other over, using only their legs.

APPENDIX

A DEFENSE OF GAKUMON NO SUSUME

By Gokurō Semban,[1] Keiō School, 1874

THERE have been many recent attacks on Fukuzawa Yukichi's *Gakumon no susume*. These attacks seem to have been aimed mostly at Sections Six and Seven. Intelligent people have the right to express their views, of course, and I am not venturing to refute these critics to cajole public opinion. But I find that there are many who seem to make rash criticisms of only a section or a phrase of the book, or without even closely examining Sections Six and Seven, which are the main targets of their attacks. This is the reason I should here like to express my own view in public.

Section Six of *Gakumon no susume* discusses the importance of the national constitution, and reproaches the evil of private vendetta. It says that when people are subject to a government, they have completely entrusted the power over life and death to the government, so that they no longer have any right to that power. Broadening this principle, Fukuzawa says that even in an extreme case when a burglar breaks into one's home, the owner has no right to lay his hands recklessly on the man. He thus explains the evil of private vendetta, and at the end of Section Six he gives examples such as the faithful retainers of Akō and the assassinations of political enemies. This is my interpretation of Section Six.

Section Seven supplements the argument of Section Six. For the convenience of understanding, it divides people's functions into that of masters and guests. Once people agree to this arrangement between themselves and the government, and have promised to live thus under the Meiji government, they have no right to take inconveniences of

[1] Gokurō Semban 五九樓仙萬 was the pen-name used by Fukuzawa in his vindication of Section Seven of *An Encouragement of Learning* against the charge that he had equated the loyalty of a male servant (of some household) named Gonsuke with the heroic Imperial loyalism of the fourteenth-century warrior, Kusunoki Masashige. It is illustrative of the well-known Nankō-Gonsuke controversy which *An Encouragement of Learning* set in motion in its day.

the laws as a pretext to break the laws. This principle proclaims the rightful authority of the government. From the standpoint of the people as masters, in which capacity they support the government's expenses and entrust the public welfare to the government, the people must shoulder both the losses and gains of the government. If they disagree with the government's measures, they must quietly report and discuss their views without hesitation. Thus, the purpose of the principle is to make every citizen of Japan consider his country as his own and to defend the independence of Japan.

In the middle paragraphs of Section Seven, Fukuzawa discusses the question of changing the government. He raises the difficult question of what should be done if the government forgets its duty and becomes despotic. The author then gives three alternatives of action. First, to compromise principles by yielding to the despotic government, thus leaving a bad precedent for later generations and weakening the country. Those who have true and patriotic hearts would not act in this insincere way. Secondly, to rise up against this despotic government with force of arms. Fukuzawa argues that this course of action is incomparably worse. Thirdly, to live under tyrannical government while adhering to one's principles even at the cost of martyrdom. The purpose of this idea is strictly to suppress violence in favor of persuasive reason. As this section was an abridged translation of page 366 of Wayland's *Morals*, I will myself translate the passage which comes right after the section which Fukuzawa has translated, by way of supplementing the reader's information.

We read on page 367:

> In England during the reign of Charles I, people could no longer endure the tyranny of the government, and public criticism was aroused. Finally, after a civil war, the king was dethroned and a republican government was temporarily set up. But the people continued to be repressed under it too. This government came to an end several years later, and Charles II ascended the throne, but the government became increasingly despotic. It was as if the English had lost their freedom by seeking it, and bought tyranny with tyranny. This shows how wrong rebellion is. During Charles II's reign, the popular spirit changed. Instead of relying on violence, people advocated reason and continued to sacrifice their lives for the sake of principle. Through their martyrdoms they laid the foundation for the freedom and independence of modern England.

At the end, Fukuzawa deals with the question of martyrdom. He compares it with rebellion, and discourses on the relative merits of each. He says that loyalty should be valued as a human act, but there is no reason to make it an end in itself and to think that loyalty is the mere giving of one's life for one's lord. As for his example of the faithful servant, Gonsuke, who hung himself, if we pass over the circumstances of his death to consider only his death itself, we cannot help calling it too a kind of dying out of the motive of loyalty. It was no different in that regard from the death of a loyal retainer. But, then, should Gonsuke's death not become a model for men? By no means, for his death was no more than a stubborn dog's death, since it gave no benefit to civilization.

As for the question of faithful samurai and loyal retainers of past history, we can see that there were many indeed who died for their country or their lord. When the Hōjō clan perished and Takatoki killed himself, six thousand eight hundred men committed suicide with him. Even though Takatoki was a rebel, we must say that those who followed him in suicide were loyal retainers of the Hōjō house. In addition to this case, innumerable retainers died for their lords on both sides when the Takeda and Uesugi clans clashed in battle. But from our present vantage point, for what reason did they give their lives? Fukuzawa points out that if the Takeda and Uesugi clashed in arms in modern Japan, we could not help saying that the samurai who died in battle were throwing away their lives in vain.

Moreover, we can make this same point by citing the examples of foreign countries as well. In the past, France and Spain fought religious wars. Countless numbers killed others at the command of their rulers, or died in battle for their rulers. The loyalty of these persons is no cause for shame, but seen through the eyes of modern European civilization, those who died in these religious wars died like dogs.

Why do I say that the loyal retainers and faithful samurai died like dogs as they followed their lord to the grave? In the uncivilized world of that time, men's purposes went no further than their own individual spheres of action. They did not extend their gaze to the peace and prosperity of the nation as a whole. This was not their own fault, but the forces of the times. In the past, their deaths were expressions of loyalty; but today, they would be meaningless and in vain. Therefore later times may admire their intentions, but should not ape their deeds. In the criticism of the master of Aikodō found in No. 368 of the *Chōya shimbun,* he says that Fukuzawa has said the forty-seven samurai had no purpose

and that Fukuzawa's censure of them is difficult to understand. But if we consider the changes in history and civilization several hundred years since, there should be no objection to saying that people then did not have the ideals of modern civilization. But this is no shame upon those men of old. We must highly prize the attainment of civilization in modern times, but this is not a reason to credit modern men at the expense of the ancients. The men of past history lived in their own times and acted according to their own values; modern people must now act according to modern values. In this manner each age fulfils its function of being human.

Kusunoki Masashige's name does not appear within the text of *Gakumon no susume*. But I will discuss it as society has interpreted Fukuzawa's intention. It is not necessary here to speak at great length about the loyalty and courage of Masashige. The question is, did Fukuzawa mean to equate Masashige with the Gonsuke in his text? Did Fukuzawa say that if Gonsuke had fought as well as Masashige in the Genkō and Shōhei Revolts, there would be no difference in their merits? I can attest that he never expressed such an idea either in writing or in his speech. The focus of Fukuzawa's essay was on the revolutions of the times, on history prior to and after the advent of modern civilization. The only point on which he compared Gonsuke with that loyal knight was that of their deaths. The loyal samurai was like a sword blade by Masamune, Gonsuke like a rusty kitchen knife. Considered in terms of the dignity of their activities and merits, their deaths cannot be compared, even though, in the above metaphor, both the Masamune blade and kitchen knife may be made of iron. It would do violence to human reason to think that they could be compared; indeed, it is ridiculous even to hear it said. If a person has any genuine human sentiment at all, he will distinguish the two cases. When Lord Kusunoki established his merit in the Genkō and Shōhei Revolts, he flashed the aforementioned sword of quality. When he plotted for the sake of the Imperial house, his sword alone flashed in the land. Therefore the greatness of Masashige lay not in his death, but in his actions. And what did his actions purport? Their goal was to restore the political authority of the nation for the Imperial house. As deeds for those times, they are above all criticism. He fulfilled his duty to the utmost.

Yet if we consider the matter from the changes of history from the medieval world to the Meiji period, the present goals for which the Japanese people must strive are greatly different. During the Genkō and Shōhei revolts, the usurpers of the political prestige of the Imperial house

were the Hōjō and the Ashikaga. The seat of political power had shifted internally within Japan, but in terms of blood line, the emperors of the Northern Court were also Imperial princes. While there may have been rebellious ministers and subjects from ancient times, even Masashige did not believe that anyone would suddenly try to usurp the Imperial dignity. But Masashige was discontent with the situation. To the very end, he gave his strength and his life fighting for the true line of succession, and to return its political authority to the Imperial house. From one respect, these events were very regrettable. But it was not that the Imperial dignity had finally been usurped by foreign hands. Since it had not, Masashige may have had the hope of regaining it for the Emperor; although he was ultimately frustrated, he must have had this one ray of hope. Therefore, compared with the foreign threat which the present Japanese people have to cope with in the Meiji period, Masashige's situation was far more endurable. His task was far lighter than the present responsibility of the Japanese people. This is a result of the changes of history from the pre-modern to the modern world. We must not forget this essential point. The present crisis is in fact the first and the most serious one for Japan since the founding of the Japanese empire.

The prime source of grievance for Japan in the Meiji period has been relations with the West. In commercial transactions, the Westerners are wealthy and skilful, we Japanese are poor and unskilful. Concerning the authority of the courts, many Japanese citizens suffer injustices, but some of the foreigners escape the law. We must learn foreign methods of study, and borrow their foreign capital. Since we now want to open the country gradually and follow the direction of modern civilization, they assert the principle of free trade and suddenly demand to have access to the interior of Japan. In every matter they take the offense and we the defense, with never a proper balance between us. As these conditions are accelerating, unless we Japanese amend our old customs, the prestige of Japan will inevitably decline, even if no war breaks out with the West. Indeed, it will decline even more, in the event of some unforeseen crisis. Considering this threat, we have just cause for genuine alarm.

In these difficult times, it is not enough to think that each Japanese citizen fulfils his obligation simply by saying that he is ready to offer his life in case of emergency. This is certainly not my opinion. The political authority of the Genkō and Shōhei times fell into the hands of Ashikaga Takauji, but there can be no Takauji in the Meiji period. Our present formidable enemies are in reality the countries of the West. This

was the meaning of Fukuzawa's allusion to 'the bold and dauntless foreigners' in the third section of *Gakumon no susume*. If Japan loses her sovereignty today, her political authority will not merely pass from the Imperial house but from the shores of Japan. If it passes from the Imperial house there is still some hope of recovering it, but if it passes to foreign hands it will never be recovered. How can we follow the same path of India? We must focus our attention upon the relative values of things. Can we imitate the deeds of Masashige in these present times of crisis? I am saying that we cannot. We must admire his spirit, but not take his deeds as our model. As we see in the above example, Masashige's deeds were like a Masamune sword. In the age of swords, this Masamune sword could be considered the finest of weapons. But with the changes of history, even this superlative weapon became useless, and it was necessary to devise other instruments. This is precisely the way of change.

There was no danger from foreign countries in the age of Masashige. Because there was none, there was no need to respond to it. It was not Masashige's fault that he acted as he did, for such were his times. But present-day scholars excessively admire his aspirations and loyalty, and think that even his deeds should be emulated. It seems that some persons are trying to apply his ancient deeds and apply them unchanged to the needs of the present. To use a metaphor, it is no different from employing ancient-style spears and swords in an age of rifles. This is the reason why I doubt the efficacy of their ideas. As I view Masashige, if he were brought back to life today, I think he would take upon himself the responsibility of the independence of Japan. He would work for the rights of every Japanese citizen, for the general security and prosperity, and for Japan's national strength, and thereby preserve the continuity of the Imperial house. He would work to make the national structure one and indivisible and to make it increasingly beam forth its light. He would strive to bring Japan up to a place of equality with all the nations of the world. For these are the great principles of civilization today. In order to accomplish these great tasks, how can we rely only on one death, like his of old? There must be adaptability in ten thousand forms.

If Russian or English ships showed up today to invade the harbor of Hyōgo, Masashige would certainly not be satisfied with merely sacrificing his own life as he did at Minatogawa. I cannot venture to guess what his method of responding to the present crisis would be, but we can know that he would have changed his strategy. In the last analysis, death is a deed of the flesh; mediocre men can die in vain by killing themselves like dogs. Adaptability is a work of intelligence; it is the power to

discern the relative values of things and the changes of the times. Masashige was hardly a mediocre man. If alive today, he would certainly concentrate his view on the whole situation. Since today's crisis is different from the Genkō and Shōhei times, he would take another course of action and give his life in a different way. The ancient dispute was an internal one, but the Meiji crisis comes from abroad, and is much graver. This is the reason why Masashige's action in the Meiji period would be different from the days of old. Therefore one who admires the personality of Masashige and would make him a model of the present age should imagine what course of action his hero would really take in Meiji times and strive to follow that action as his rule. Only in this manner will we be able to say that he has understood the true spirit of Masashige. A man who thinks that the Masashige of medieval times would act in the same manner today, so many hundred years later, has not yet fully understood him. On the contrary, we may say that he really despises him, and this is something which we must regret for Masashige's sake. Even though Masashige's loyalty would perdure unchanged throughout all time, his actions would not be immutably the same. This is the precise reason why Masashige was the person that he was.

When I speak of adaptability, some high-spirited young people may rashly take this as a cowardly excuse. But we must think about the question with composure. That Hōjō Tokimune beheaded the envoy from the Mongol court during the Kōan period may well be called a heroic deed. But what if Tokimune lived in the Meiji period and beheaded an envoy from Russia or England; of if some Meiji citizen should imitate Tokimune's deed at the present time? It would be sheer madness. For the times are different. We are at a different stage of civilization. Generally speaking, everything will be adaptable if its historical time and place are disregarded. Such is the way of adaptability.

Such was the main import of Fukuzawa's argument. Considering the above points, we cannot say that Fukuzawa did not understand Masashige. We may say that he even understood Masashige better than most informed people. The reason that such a mass of bewildering attacks has been leveled against *Gakumon no susume* of late is that both sides are clashing over unessential points without either side expressing its main view. In all probability the newspaper contributors have the most patriotic intentions, but they are not as keen as Fukuzawa in perceiving the problems connected with intercourse with the West. They are not so thoroughgoing in the pursuit of national independence, not so clearsighted in discerning the changes of the times and in weighing the relative

priorities of things. Thus they end up digressing into arguments over unessential points. I believe that Fukuzawa has no need to worry himself over these loud public criticisms. Rather, he must be concerned about the superficiality of the controversy in the context of modern problems.

Other attacks against Fukuzawa have come from those who want to refute his remarks about republican government, Christianity, etc. They are completely off the track! To say that Fukuzawa advocated republican government or was attracted to Christianity—from what document or from what person has this information been gotten? Fukuzawa advocated democracy because he dislikes the despotism prevalent in the world today. He has stated his views publicly, not privately. Japan has also had from ancient times a deep-rooted tradition of despotic governments, because of which her spirit has declined and there is fear that the Japanese people could not bear up under relations with the West. Accordingly Fukuzawa's original intention was to maintain Japanese independence by correcting this abuse as much as possible. His idea was to counter one-sided governmental authority by stressing the rights of the people, and thus to develop the power of the whole nation against the foreign threat. One must first distinguish matters under discussion, such as republican government, Christianity, people's rights, despotism, etc. Fukuzawa hates despotic tyranny. And on this he is not alone, for every human being hates it. Again, religion and politics are entirely different things. As regards religion, too, he has expressed his view for many years. I need not repeat it here. (Concerning his views on religion as well, if people listen sympathetically to what he has to say, they would surely be amazed at the profundity of his views.) Must despotism and tyranny necessarily accompany monarchy, and freedom and human rights only be realized under a democratic form of government? What books and whose utterances are the sources of such inferences? I should like to discuss this point a little further in closing.

Despotism is like a fever, and politics is the human body. Persons differ in sex and age, but they are all capable of contracting a fever. In politics, too, there are different kinds, such as monarchy and a republic, but they may all become despotic. A despotic monarchy derives from one person's ideas, while misgovernment in a democracy stems from a number of people. But both are equally forms of despotism. They are like two human beings who are capable of coming down with the fever, regardless of sex or age. Whatever premises one starts from, there is no reason to conclude that the fever is limited to only one sex, or that despo-

tism is limited to monarchies. Guizot [1787–1874] wrote in his *History of European Civilization:*

> A monarchy can be instituted in a country like India, which adheres to a caste system, or in a country in which people live together without class distinctions. It may be practiced in a world of despotism and oppression, or in a free and civilized society. A king is a strange kind of head which can be attached to political institutions of different kinds. Or a king is like a strange kind of fruit that can grow on different kinds of political trees.

The above ideas are not novel. They should be well known by intellectuals. But the fact that people still harbor old-fashioned doubts about such things as Christianity and republican forms of government must ultimately be due to an abuse of impaired vision. If one eye is covered over, the truth appears distorted. People think that equal rights is equivalent to democracy; and that democracy is the same as Christianity; that Christianity is Western learning. They are thus misled by their own suppositions and imaginations. Since Fukuzawa is a scholar of Western learning, they suppose that his views on people's rights must necessarily be Christian or democratic views. And so they have become greatly indignant. If I may use a vulgar example, the owner of a wine shop is not necessarily a drinker, and the master of a *mochi* shop is not necessarily a non-drinker. A person should not immediately judge the inside of a house as he runs by its gate, nor be angry at an owner from just looking at his shop. Their anger may spring, not from selfishness, but from their sincere patriotism; but we can say that they have hearts which are concerned about their country but do not know the proper reasons why.

INDEX

Aikodō, 117
Akō, 37, 38, 73, 115
America, 3, 15, 84, 94
Amida, 93
Analects, 9
Ancien régime, 93
Asano, 37, 38
Ashigaru, 19, 50
Ashikaga, 31, 119; Takauji, 119
Assassination, 14, 38, 86, 115

Bakin, 107
Barbarism, 83
Boku, 70
Botamochi, 42
Britain, 79. *See also* England
British, business interests, 79; government, 79
Buddha, 14, 93, 94
Buddhism, 98

Catholics, 98
Charles I, 116; II, 116
Chawanmushi, 98
China, 59, 89
Chinese, 4, 71, 79; characters, 2; Classics, 9, 19; histories, 19; learning, 2, 24, 51, 66; proverb, 96
Chōnin, 2 *and* n., 19
Chou, 51; dynasty, 71
Chōya shimbun, 117
Christianity, 93, 98, 122, 123
Christ, Jesus, 97
Chu Hsi philosophy, 75
Chūsuke, 71
Clarkson, Thomas, 93
Confucian gentleman, 108; scholar, 77, 104
Confucius, 14, 16, 51, 53, 77, 83, 109

Daimaru, 107
Daimyo, 11, 20, 72
Defamation, 81
Despotism, 73, 122
Diet, 84; chamber, 65

Encouragement of Learning, 10. *See also Gakumon no susume*
England, 3, 15, 17, 18, 84, 116, 121
Enshū, sea of, 76
Enzetsu, 75
Equality, of man, 10, 13; of nations, 15
Europe, 15. *See also* West
'Expulsion of foreigners', 3

False gentlemen, 72, 73
Filial piety, 54
Forty-seven retainers, 37, 73, 117
France, 18, 111, 117
Franklin, Benjamin, 87
French business interests, 79; revolution, 93
Fudō Myō-ō, 93

Gakumon no susume, 115 *and* n., 118, 119, 121
Galileo, 93
Galvani, 93
Genkō revolt, 118, 119, 121
Genroku period, 73
Geta, 97
Go, 103, 112
Gō, 109
Gokurō Semban, 115 *and* n.
Gonsuke, 47, 117, 118
Guizot, 123

Haori, 101
History of European Civilization, 123
Hōjō, 117, 119, 121; Takatoki, 117; Tokimune, 121
Honor, 23
Hōreki period, 60
Hyakumanben, 50
Hyōgo, 120

Imagawa Yoshimoto, 18
India, 79

Japanese, citizens, 16, 21, 22, 37; civilization, 24, 30, 32, 33, 95; independence, 21; learning, 2, 24, 51, 66; people, 4, 26, 76, 84, 96, 97, 98, 99, 111, 119, 122; reformation, 99
Jesus, 97
Jitsugokyō, 1
Jizō, stone image of, 104

Keiō Private School, 7, 29, 33, 39, 40, 115
Kengi, 15
Kenri tsūgi, 15
Kifū, 23
Kira Kōzuke-no-suke, 37, 38

Kōan period, 121
Kojiki, 9
Konoike, 88
Kōshū, 110
Kusunoki Masashige, 115 n., 118, 119, 120, 121

Luther, Martin, 93, 98

Masamune, 118, 120
Meibun, 73, 74
Meiji, government, 32; Japan, 83; period, 13, 118, 119, 121; restoration, 4, 22, 24, 31, 60 n.
Mencius, 53, 54
Metsuke, 107
'Might makes right', 12
Mill, J. Stuart, 94
Ministry of Education, 40
Mitsui, 88, 107
Miso, 67, 97
Mochi, 123
Modern civilization, 32
Mongol court, 121
Moral conduct, 76–9
Morals, 116
Moral Science, 49
Moral subservience, 73, 74

Nakatsu, 7, 57, 63, 66
Nankō-Gonsuke controversy, 115 n.
Napoleon, 18
'National seclusion', 3
Nembutsu, 93
Newton, 93

Oda Nobunaga, 18
Okami-sama, 12
Okehazama, 18
Onna daigaku, 52
Oota Tadami, 39, 40

Parent-child relations, 69, 70. *See also* Filial piety
Parliament, 11
Protestantism, 98

Russia, 121

Sakura Sōgo, 47
Śākyamuni, 51
Samurai, 5, 11, 12, 19, 37, 66, 89, 104, 117, 118
Sanke, 20
Sei-shi, 96, 99

Sengoku, 18
Seppuku, 37, 46
Sewa, 90, 91, 92
Shinran, Saint, 98, 99
Shōgi, 103, 112
Shōhei revolt, 118, 119, 121
Shokubun, 74
Smith, Adam, 32
Spain, 117
Stevenson, 32
Sumō, 10
Suruga, 18

Takatoki, 117
Takauji, 119
Takeda, 117
Tōfu, 97
Tōkaidō, 4, 75
Tokimune, 121
Tokugawa, period, 37; shogunate, 4, 11, 12, 19, 20, 31, 37, 38
Translations, of Western books, 2
'Triple obedience' for women, 52
True Pure Land, 98
Turkey, 79

Uesugi, 117

Watt, 32, 93
Way of the warrior, 72
Wayland, 49, 116
West, 13, 16, 52, 65, 79, 96, 99
Western, books, 22; civilization, 32, 64, 95, 96, 99; countries, 59, 60; custom, 102; languages, 2; learning, 24, 25, 60, 63, 64, 77, 89, 123; scholars, 26; schools, 78; studies, 9, 26

Yokohama, 19
Yukata, 102

Zen, priests, 49; sect, 77

DATE DUE

MAY 1 6 1987			
DEC 9 1987			
29903587			
GAYLORD			PRINTED IN U.S.A.

775
81313